

1140.4  
N556  
S98  
1994

Report of the Research Project:  
Studies in Traditional Cultures in the Context of Ancient Indian and Indo-European Societies

**A Study of the Nīlamata**  
**— Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir —**

edited by  
**Yasuke IKARI**

Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University  
KYOTO  
1994

## A Study of the Nīlamata—Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir—

### I.

Kashmiri Manuscripts and Pronunciation .....	M. WITZEL .....	1
On the Textual Formation of the Nīlamatapūrāṇa .....	M. FUJII .....	55
*Ādi-Purāṇa .....	Y. IKARI and T. HAYASHI .....	83

### II.

Analysis of the Ritual Structure in the Nīlamata .....	S. EINOŌ .....	137
Pañcarātra Elements in the Ritual of the Nīlamata .....	H. HIKITA .....	199
Calender and Related Subjects in the Nīlamatapūrāṇa .....	M. YANO .....	223

### III.

The Brahmins of Kashmir .....	M. WITZEL .....	237
Metre and Euphony (sandhi) in the Nīlamatapūrāṇa .....	H. NAKATANI .....	295
<i>Devagāṇas</i> in the Epico-Purāṇic Literature .....	M. TOKUNAGA .....	341
A Note on Kashmir as Referred to in Chinese Literature: Ji-bin .....	F. ENOMOTO .....	357
Remarks on Religious Predominance in Kashmir; Hindu or Buddhist? .....	T. FUNAYAMA .....	367
A Note on <i>bhojya</i> - and <i>bhaksya</i> - .....	T. YAGI .....	377

### Appendix

Description of Temples and <i>Tīrthas</i> in the Nīlamatapūrāṇa. Vss. 989–1356a .....	M. TOKUNAGA .....	399
Map of Ancient <i>Tīrthas</i> in Kashmir Valley .....	Y. IKARI .....	423



# Kashmiri Manuscripts and Pronunciation

Michael WITZEL

## §1 Introduction

The older MSS of the NM are written in the local script of Kashmir, the Śāradā script, on old Kashmiri made “country paper”. Doubtlessly, if we had earlier MSS of the NM than those that have come down to us, notably through the activities of Georg Bühler and Mark Aurel Stein, they would have been written on birch bark (*bhūrja*) leaves, as are all older Kashmiri MSS. In order to understand the peculiarities of the NM manuscripts we therefore have to investigate the nature of these *bhūrja* and paper MSS as well as the type of Śāradā script used in the middle ages and in more recent times.

In addition, the MSS of Kashmir are influenced, as in any other area of the Indian subcontinent, by the local pronunciation. This has already been indicated by Bühler but scholars generally have paid little attention to this beyond a few rudimentary points. No investigation of the local pronunciation of Sanskrit in Kashmir has appeared so far, a fact that has hampered the understanding of many mistakes in the MSS, especially so in the case of the Kashmiri version of the Paippalāda Atharvaveda.

In spite of Bühler’s *Report* (1877), the importance of these facts and especially the *reasons* for these developments have not really been understood well. They are, in any case, not extensively referred to by many scholars who have used Kashmiri MSS. As a case in point, both de Vreese and Ved Kumari have not made an evaluation of the facts with regard to the NM, and they did not make enough use of the material collected by Bühler.

It may be useful, therefore, to state the problems of Kashmiri writing and pronunciation peculiarities and mistakes clearly here. In the following chapter, these points will be investigated to some extent. A still more detailed investigation will appear elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> Before going into details, however, an overview of the major problems is given first.

### 1. Scriptual Mistakes based on Śāradā Misreadings

Any user of Kashmiri MSS is faced with several problems:

—the difficulties of Śāradā script and especially its ligatures,



- a large number of confusions between certain *akṣaras* and ligatures,
- some persistent peculiarities of Sanskrit “orthography” in Kashmir.

However, an advantage of Kashmiri MSS is that the ligatures in Śāradā often differ sufficiently enough from those in Nāgarī so that editorial decisions are made easier in the case of certain readings which are problematic in Nāgarī.<sup>2</sup>

Actual writing mistakes are frequent in the case of a few similar characters (*m/s*, *u/ta*, etc. and some ligatures) but otherwise less common, as in Kashmir there was a comparatively continuous tradition both of development of the script and of copying MSS. The Śāradā script has not been subject to such major breaks in styles (and, therefore, in the copying tradition) as that between late Gupta (*Siddhamātrkā*) script and early Devanāgarī in Northern and Western India, as well as in Nepal and Eastern India, where a separate development took place that lead to the Newārī, Maithilī, Bengālī and Oriyā scripts.

Such a break,<sup>3</sup> caused by the introduction of a widely differing type of script at a particular moment in history, usually resulted in a large number of misreadings by scribes who lived a hundred or more years after the change: they often were no longer able to decipher the old characters correctly and they subsequently introduced large numbers of mistakes into the medieval copies. This is a point usually not recognized by philologists who have not been exposed to work with manuscripts, ever since the bulk of our text editions has been made between 1850 and 1900.<sup>4</sup>

Apart from this “(Deva-)Nāgarī shift”,<sup>5</sup> a similar one must have occurred after the change from Brahmī to Gupta script. Some time after its definite emergence the older MSS must have become difficult to read. We should investigate some such misreadings in the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa, or in texts such as the Mahābhāṣya.<sup>6</sup> In the case of the present text this perhaps is not really a problem, as it can be doubted that even the nucleus of the Nīlamata is that old (but cf. the direct statement of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī about a second revelation of the Nīlamata-Purāṇa in post-Kuṣāṇa times, during the reign of King Abhimanyu, Rājatarāṅgiṇī 1.183).<sup>7</sup>

Such changes in script and the misreadings and miswritings they brought with them were amplified by the negligent tendencies of the scribes, who always absolve themselves by the such doggerels as “*yathā dṛṣṭam, tathā likhitam*” etc., but nevertheless copy the texts in such a careless fashion that Albīrūnī, already in 1030 A.D., was led to complain: “The Indian scribes are careless, and do not take pains to procure correct and well-collated copies. In consequence, the highest results of the author’s mental development are lost by their negligence, and his book becomes already in the first or second copy so full of faults, that the text



appears as something entirely new, which [no one] could any longer understand.”

## 2. Purely Phonetical Variants

Mistakes that arose in the course of the scriptural transmission are not the only ones that must occupy us here. Again, in spite of Bühler's *Report*, it has not been recognized sufficiently that many of the mistakes in Kashmiri MSS are due to the influence of Kashmiri pronunciation.

At this point it may suffice to point out that there is a large number of typical Kashmiri features of Sanskrit pronunciation, such as those of *u* [ō] or *i* [ē], which were already mentioned by Bühler. They create a number of uncertainties in the mind of any Kashmiri scribe, even the learned ones, of how to write certain (even quite common) words. This feature is well known from other areas of India, too: for example, the pronunciation of *v* as [b] and also *y* as [j] is typical for Northern India, and consequently, the confusion of *b/v* and *y/j* is found in many Devanāgarī MSS. In the case of Kashmir, however, there is such a large number of such peculiarities which can *simultaneously* occur even in a small part of a text that it becomes virtually unintelligible. This is especially the case with many sections of the Paippalāda Saṁhitā. Luckily, most Vedic and other MSS have been written much more conscientiously than the PS but, on the other hand, texts abounding in local names such as the Rājatarāṅgiṇī or the NM, especially in its Nāga section, are prone to be influenced by the typical Kashmiri writing habits.

A second point to be noted is the following. The confusion of two sounds does not work only in one direction. As *|u, ū|* usually is pronounced [ō] in Kashmir, any *|ō|* in a Sanskrit word can also be written *|u, ū|*. To continue with the example of [ō], a group written *consonant + va* is also pronounced with the [ō] quality of the vowel [Cō], and, *vice versa*, any [Co] can also be written *|Cva|*. This provides a glimpse of the large number of confusing possibilities in the “orthography” of Kashmiri Sanskrit MSS, not to speak of the texts in medieval Kashmiri, such as Lallā's *Vākyāni*, or again, the personal and place names in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī or the Nāga names in the Nīlamata.

## 3. “Learned” Mistakes

Then, there are the mistakes committed by more or less learned scribes and some medieval Kashmiri scholars who consciously or unconsciously tried to “improve” their MSS. These “improvements” are derived both from pronunciation and writing mistakes, found by a scribe or scholar in the MS he was copying. In most cases they were not due to actual deliberations of variants by the copyist or scholar but to his more or less automatic “corrections” of the text in front of



him. Such “corrections” have been indicated elsewhere, in the case of the Kashmirian Paippalāda Saṃhitā.<sup>8</sup>

4. Kashmiri Orthographic Peculiarities: the scribal conventions of Kashmir.

The MSS of both the Vedic and the classical texts in Kashmir share a number of peculiarities of “orthography” which are not or no longer followed in India proper.

The common orthography of the Devanāgarī MSS of the Benares/Poona traditions has become the model both for early Indian editions and for nearly all Western editions, even in those few books that purport to be critical editions. It is rather curious that this fact was never been noticed, probably because already by the 1870 a ‘modern’ tradition of how to edit Vedic and classical texts had been established. Thus, even if the all or the major ‘spelling peculiarities’ of the MSS on which such editions were based were indeed mentioned by their editors—a not too frequent case—this has been done only in the introductions. Unfortunately, in most cases, readers of such editions do not ‘detect’ them, or if they indeed read such detailed introductions carefully, they quickly forget about them. Editions, and even Vedic ones, have been normalized according to the above mentioned Benares/Poona standard,—in spite of the large number of deviations from this rather artificial norm in South Indian, Gujarati, Nepalese or Kashmiri MSS.

Now, such a procedure may not be very damaging as long as only the substitution of *Anunāsika m* > *Anusvāra m* is involved, as this is automatic and can be remedied once one knows about it. But even this seemingly simple and obvious fact of “orthography”, which is overlooked or left out by most editors, becomes immediately interesting when one notices the frequent Kashmiri (and also Nepali, Oriya, Gujarati, etc.) mistake of *am* > *e/o* and, vice versa, *e/o* > *am*. How this could come about is easily understandable if one knows that *-am* is very close, in older Nāgarī, Siddhamātrikā, and Śāradā, to *-o-*, or to *-e-*.

In this way, many of the ‘peculiarities’ of the MSS help to understand corruptions.—This fact should be kept quite separate from the necessity of always reporting all variants completely as testimonia of a certain stages in the tradition of the particular text studied.—In the present case, that of Kashmiri peculiarities, the MSS generally represent an older stage of Indian writing traditions than that represented by the usual North or West Indian MSS used for most of our editions. This can most easily be recognized in the fact that many of the ‘peculiarities’ of Kashmir MSS reoccur in older Vedic MSS and even in MSS of classical texts from Gujarat, Nepal, or South India.

One might argue that such peculiarities are nothing but medieval local



varieties.<sup>9</sup> However, for example the retention of writing *-sch-* in Kashmir<sup>10</sup> in Vedic and classical texts instead of “normal Indian” *-cch-* argues against this supposition. The cluster *|cch|* has been pronounced in Kashmir, already in the middle ages, as *[tʰh]* (and likewise, *|c|* as *[tʰ]*). In fact, the history of the consonant cluster represented by Kashmiri *|sch|*, R̥gvedic *|ch|*, Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā *|ch|*, etc. is much more complicated and cannot be treated here.<sup>11</sup>

Other<sup>12</sup> Kashmiri orthographic peculiarities include:

- *Visarga* is used only in Pausa; instead, before the voiceless velars (“gutturals”) *k-* *kh-*, *Visarga* is replaced by *Jihvāmūlīya h* (written by some as *x*), and before the voiceless labials *p-*, *ph-*, *Visarga* is substituted by *Upadhmānīya h* (also written *φ*).

- In those cases where sibilant is preceded by *Visarga*, the Kashmiri MSS invariably write double sibilant:

in N/W India                      in Kashmir:

*-ḥ ś-*                                      *-ś ś-*

*-ḥ ṣ-*                                      *-ṣ ṣ-*

*-ḥ s-*                                      *-s s-*

- homorganic nasal + consonant > *Anusvāra* + cons.<sup>13</sup>

The choice of *Anusvāra* or *Anunāsika* varies even within a Vedic school in MSS from Kashmir. The norm seems to be: *Anunāsika* (*m̐*) before *y*, *r*, *v*, *l*, *ś*, *ṣ*, *s*, *h*; but often enough, even within the Kaṭha texts *Anusvāra* (*m̐*) is written before *y*, *r*, *v*.<sup>14</sup>

- *-CCr-* for the usual (though not generally) found internal *-Cr-*. In RV (K) especially, when a short vowel precedes.<sup>15</sup>

The following traits in Kashmir tradition remain which may generally occur only in Kashmiri Veda tradition:

- consonants occasionally<sup>16</sup> are also doubled before *v*, *y*: *marúttvatā*, *iddhyase*, also in initial position (including *Cr-*: *tu śśrudhi*, *devī ssvádhitir*, *sádane vvyūrṇuhi*);

- *-n s-* does not develop to *-nts-*. This is found in the Kashmirian RV<sup>17</sup> MS, and also avoided, in spite of his MSS, by Aufrecht (ed. p. VI) who did not like such “Wortungethüme” as “*nṛ̐nt stotṛ̐nt striyaś ca*.”

- *-n ś->ñ sch-*: *maghanvañ śchakra*, but:

- *-ān ś->ām/añ ś-*: instead of usual *-āñ ś-*, *svadhāvāṃ śukró* for *svadhāvāñ śukró*; *karmañ śatām* for *karmāñ śatām*.<sup>18</sup>

- *-ñkd(h)->-ñd(h)-*: *añdhve>añdhve*<sup>19</sup>, but, usually, *-ñCk(h)/g(h)* is kept;

- *-s sC->-φ sC-* (*C*=surd cons., *y*, *r*, *v*).<sup>20</sup> In the Kashmirian RV, among other



texts,<sup>21</sup> this rule is generally followed with all double consonants before another consonant, in internal position:

*sst* > *st*, *hsv* > *sv*, *ttv* > *tv*, *tts* > *ts* etc., but also: *kṣṣ* > *kṣ*, *ntt* > *nt* etc.

- a peculiar case is that of *ch* doubled after all vowels, thus *áschā*, *gaśchati* (usually after short vowels).
- consonants are also double before *v*: *marúttvatā* 1.20.5
- (-nn V-<sometimes -n V-)
- -m labial-<ṃ labial

The infrequent cases of *Visarga* instead of *Upādhmānīya*, *Jihvāmūliya* are indicative of the late date of MSS.

## §2 Description of Kashmiri MSS

The older Kashmiri manuscripts were invariably written on birchbark in Śāradā script. Paper has been introduced to Kashmir only relatively late, by King Zain ul Abīdīn (1420–1470 A.D.) but has been in common use for MSS only since the 17th century.<sup>22</sup>

The script used in Kashmir and the surrounding areas invariably has been the Śāradā script which goes back, just as Devanāgarī, to a Gupta ancestor, but has developed in a different way. Śāradā, however, is extremely conservative and resembles, much more than Nāgarī, the late stages of Gupta or Siddhamātrkā script. Devanāgarī was introduced to the Valley only by the Dogra dynasty (after 1850)<sup>23</sup> and was still largely unknown to the Pandits at the time of Bühler's visit in 1875.

In addition to the Śāradā MSS, there are quite a few more recent MSS of Kashmiri provenance, written in a particular, Śāradā-influenced form of Devanāgarī. This has been used by the emigrants from Kashmir in Northern India and is frequently found among the copies made at Jammu for the Raghunath Temple Library in middle of the the last century (cf. below).

### 1. Description of Bhūrja MSS

The Kashmirian birch bark MSS have a number of peculiarities which necessitate a short description. This has been done by G. Bühler in his report, and by some later authors.<sup>24</sup> I refer to them and add, wherever necessary, my own observations.

Bühler begins<sup>25</sup> his description with the materials used for writing itself: "The Bhūrja MSS are written on specially prepared thin sheets of the inner bark of the Himalayan birch (*Baetula Bhojpatr*), and invariably in Śāradā characters. The



lines run parallel to the narrow side of the leaf, and the MSS present therefore the appearance of European books, not of Indian MSS, which owe their form to an imitation of the Tālapatras."

Bloomfield and Garbe<sup>26</sup> add: "The leaves are made of the bark of the birch-tree known to the botanists by the name *Betula Bhojpatr*, or in Sanskrit *bhūrja-patra*, which grows in the Himalaya mountains up to the height of nine thousand feet. The inner bark of this tree consists of several layers which may be successively detached. The strips obtained in this way serve as a natural, yet fragile paper. In order to make them rather more durable two strips are pasted together, back to back, yielding a sheet both sides of which are used for writing."

Kaye<sup>27</sup> further adds: "Birch bark is the outer bark of the Silver Birch (*Betula utilis*, *Betula bhojpatra*, or the *Bhūrja* tree as it is variously called) which flourishes in the Himalayas from Kashmir to Sikkim. It grows on all the higher ranges of the Kashmir hills from a height of 6,000 to 12,000 feet... To obtain the bark from a tree a deep cut is made vertically down a clean piece of a bole, and the bark is then peeled off by the hand... The most suitable size of tree is from 2 feet to 4 1/2 feet in girth. In larger trees the paper bark of the bole is rough and lignified and is of no use in writing material."

The use of *bhūrja* leaves for manuscript writing is restricted to the North-West of the subcontinent and does not exist, for example, in Nepal. Occasionally such MSS have been found in the Himalayas and in Central Asia as exports from Kashmir.<sup>28</sup>

Bühler<sup>29</sup> quotes contemporary Pandits as saying that until Akbar all MSS were written on birch bark, and that paper was introduced then. This is, however, not quite correct on two counts.<sup>30</sup> There still exists at least one birchbark MS as late as 1675 A.D., the von Hügel *Ṛcaka*, now kept at the Vienna National Library.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, paper manufacture was introduced into Kashmir already by King Zain ul Abīdīn in the middle of the 15th century, with the help of craftsmen from the Samarkand / Bukhara region.<sup>32</sup>

Bühler reported that birchbark MSS were not much younger than two hundred years, in other words, younger than the latest one known to me, the von Hügel *Ṛcaka* of 1675 A.D. Apart from the Gilgit and Central Asian MSS whose provenance is not always clear,<sup>33</sup> the oldest birch bark MSS are the Bakhshālī MS,<sup>34</sup> a Tantra MS now kept at Calcutta,<sup>35</sup> and the MS of the Paippalāda *Samhitā*, sent to R. Roth at Tübingen by the Mahārāja in 1875 and now kept at the University Library of Tübingen. This MS, or perhaps rather the original from which it was copied, was written in December 1419 A.D.<sup>36</sup>

The ink used in these MSS was made from the charcoal of almonds boiled in



*gomūtra*. This kind of ink is not damaged by water. Indeed, birchbark MSS can be made more legible by wetting or washing. Bloomfield and Garbe<sup>37</sup> add: "The writing is in indelible black ink, absolutely non-sensitive to damp and water: each page before exposure to the lense of the photographer was sponged off with water in order to make the very clear writing still clearer." Bühler reports that the Pandits regularly kept the MSS in water before selling them to him, in order to improve their appearance. He also heard of a MS which had been fished out of the Dal, the lake near the city, into which it had either been thrown during one of the Muslim persecutions or into which it had been 'offered' to Sarasvatī, as common in Benares and elsewhere, for example when the owner dies without heirs and his MSS have to be disposed off. He also heard of a MS found by a Pandit in the ceiling of his house, to which it had been nailed in order to keep the rain out.<sup>38</sup>

Bühler stresses that "the great enemy of birch bark is dry heat which causes it to crack, split and peel in all directions. The same result follows if the MSS are fingered frequently or kept carelessly, as most of the Pandits do."

Bloomfield and Garbe<sup>39</sup> sum up, referring to the Tübingen MS: "As it is, even the doubled leaves still break easily; not infrequently one of the faces of the leaf is chipped off while the other still holds out: this may be seen on several plates of the facsimile. Books written on birch-bark are not likely to last very long: an old book falling to the ground is liable to suffer very seriously, if it does not break to pieces entirely."

## 2. Binding and Preservation

About the nature of the birch leaves and the actual preparation of *bhūrja* strips for writing Kaye reports as follows: "Each layer of bark is white or pinky-white on the outer side, but is a reddish or yellowish buff on the inner side. The number of layers varies and I have counted 47 in a strip taken from an old tree. A marked feature of the bark is the existence of numerous lenticels (glands) from 1 to about 6 cm in length and from about 1 to 3 mm in depth. These lenticels are reddish-brown in colour and of darker shade than the natural reverse of the lamina, and each of them is continued throughout the several laminae. On the natural obverse they appear much more distinct by contrast with the lighter background, and in the reproductions of manuscripts this contrast sometimes appears to be emphasized. On the bole of the tree the lenticels are *horizontal* (i.e. they are always at right angles to the axis of the bole or branch) ... The lenticels are of importance from the point of view of the scribe because they are of different structure from the rest of the bark and they



sometimes break away... Birchbark, even after preparation for writing upon, retains the natural marks of the wood showing the lenticels and occasional knots. Such knots are like thumb marks in their individuality so that, if a knot occurs, it can generally be identified..."<sup>40</sup>

"The art of preparing the bark for writing upon seems to be lost"<sup>41</sup> but Albīrūnī tells us that the strips were rubbed with (?) oil and polished. The manuscripts preserve no evidence of either of these processes. All that they tell us is some process of sub-division, and arrangement. Each leaf of the Bakhshālī manuscript appears to consist of half of the original thickness of the strip, *i.e.* the original strip was divided into layers each of which consisted of some six laminae. ... The Kashmirian Atharva Veda exhibits rather more elaboration: the process of sub-division is carried out to the extreme limits and each leaf consists of two single laminae pasted together."<sup>42</sup>

The birch bark MSS usually are bound after folding half a dozen or more leaves into *saṃcayas*<sup>43</sup> and sewing these folded sheaves of birchbark leaves together. They are bound in rough country leather<sup>44</sup> and kept upright like western books.<sup>45</sup> However, as Bühler noticed, "the friction of the leather invariably destroys the first and the last leaves in a very short time, and hence many Sanskrit works from Kaśmīr have neither beginning nor end."

In a bad case, the first or last 40 or 50 fol. consist only of irregularly shaped thirds or less of a leaf, sticking out from the folding line as so many mementos of pages lost in the process ... I have seen a birchbark MS where the left half of *all* the pages had been lost, probably due to folding, and only the middle portions had been preserved, thus the left part of fol. 1a, and the right part of fol. 1b, etc. In another case hardly more than a few fragments of odd irregular shapes were attached to the original folding line and the stitching of the MS which alone had been preserved.<sup>46</sup>

Bühler warns that "long exposure to damp heat, such as prevails during the monsoons of Western India,"<sup>47</sup> is also fatal to birch-bark volumes, as it produces *fungi*, the removal of which is very troublesome. Under these circumstances it is not astonishing to find that few *Bhūrja* MSS are quite perfect. If no large portions have been lost, a few letters here and there are sure to be missing as the surface has peeled off.<sup>48</sup>

This is the most common problem with *Bhūrja* MSS, and it occurs much more frequently than breaking off of palm leaf MSS. In any text that has been transmitted in Kashmir we should therefore not be surprised to find a syllable, a word, or a phrase, and sometimes larger sections missing: they have peeled off. If this gap occurs at one place in all available MSS, we can, of course, be sure that



the damage goes back to the archetype of the text ... It is a remarkable feature of many Kashmiri scribes that they tend to mark such peeled off passages quite conscientiously in their copies by small dashes or dots which reflect the length of the lacuna quite well.<sup>49</sup> These lacunae marks are quite distinct from the commonly met with omission mark in the form of a small cross or plus sign, called *kākapāda* "crow's foot" in Kashmir.<sup>50</sup>

Sir M. A. Stein described his experiences with R̥caka MSS detailedly in a letter to L. von Schroeder.<sup>51</sup> "When a Pandit, a friend of mine, brought them [the leaves of *bhūrja* MS. called codex Stein by Schroeder] from the house of a *bāchbaṭṭa*,<sup>52</sup> they were in a very dilapidated state. The easily breakable material necessitated caution in handling it. In order to prevent further peeling off of the thin layers of birch bark I had the borders of the leaves as well as the broken leaves pasted with thin paper. This served its purpose for the time being. Unfortunately I had not foreseen the effects of an Indian rainy season. When I investigated the leaves on my arrival in Europe, I found, to my disgust, most of them sticking together. The muggy and warm air had dissolved the glue used for the repairs. On the advice of Bühler I tried to separate the leaves by holding them in hot steam. In carrying out this work which naturally proceeded very slowly, unfortunately some damage occurred through breaking off of the *bhūrja* leaflets. Here [at Jaworzno] I therefore tried another procedure. The old Kashmiri ink does not suffer [when exposed to] water. Trusting this, I let the leaves soak for some time and could then separate them more easily. Some of them have suffered damages in spite of all my caution. If you should find it necessary to repair them while studying them, I request to use, instead of gum another glue, for example paste or liquid glue." Schroeder adds: "I have used a glue made of starch meal but when using this, a number of leaves warped a little."<sup>53</sup> Bloomfield and Garbe<sup>54</sup> describe the procedures of filming the Tübingen MS of the PS as follows: "The writing is in indelible black ink, absolutely non-sensitive to damp and water: each page before exposure to the lense of the photographer was sponged off with water in order to make the very clear writing still clearer."

### 3. Set-up of a Page

Among the peculiarities of Śāradā MSS, not mentioned by Bühler or Stein, are the following: the folios are usually numbered on the *verso* side (1b, 2b etc.), in the lower, or sometimes, the upper left corner of the MS. This corner most frequently has an abbreviation of the name of the text copied, or of its chapter. Thus we get *ya ā sū*=Yajurveda Ādityasūkta, *gra śā*=Grahaśānti, *gra brā*=



Graha Brāhmaṇa, *camā*=Camānuvāka, a part of Kaṭha Saṁhitā, etc. It would be useful to make a collection of such abbreviations as they considerably help in establishing the identity of fragments, and, in any case, speed up the process of identification.

The size of Śāradā MSS is not easily described in generalized terms. There are MSS of one or two *sañcayas* (with a few dozen folios) but there also are thick volumes, bound together and protected by a leather cover, which contain hundreds of folios, often continuously numbered, such as the von Hügel Ṛcaka at Vienna.<sup>55</sup> In some cases such large volumes have a double numbering: certain sections of the MS with a common topic have their own separate numbering, while the general one continues. This feature often helps to establish a first ordering of such folios that were found detached from the MS due to careless handling.

#### 4. Colophons

The colophons of Kashmiri MSS, if they are indeed preserved, are not as detailed as one would like to see; mostly they have disappeared with the last *bhūrja* leaves of a book. I quote those of a few old MSS below. The scribes often are content with adding their name and perhaps the Laukika Samvat year, however, as is usual in Kashmir, by leaving out the century. For a large number of Kashmiri MSS we therefore have to rely on points of palaeography for dating them; if some details of the date have been given such as the weekday one can proceed with an astronomical calculation to establish the exact date of the MS. Such palaeographical investigations have now been facilitated by the collections made by B. K. Deambi Kaul.<sup>56</sup>

*Some early colophons:*

1419 A.D.

The colophon of the birch bark MS. of the Paippalāda-Saṁhitā reads, with a slightly 'corrected' reading below the text:

*ahlāmaṭṭheya mayā paṁ praśasta-Bhavana Merabha-putreṇ Otsava*  
 = Ahlamaṭṭheya- (mayā)<sup>57</sup> Paṇḍita-Praśasta-Bhavana Mīra-Bhava-putra-  
 Utsava-  
*Bhava-pautreṇā atharvaṇavedaṁ likhitam*      z z  
*Bhava-pautreṇā-Atharvaṇavedaṁ likhitam*      | |



saṃvat 95 mārḡa [ś]uti trayodaśāṃ śukravāsare z [xxxxxxxxx]

Samvaṭ 95 Mārḡa-śukla-tithau trayodaśāyāṃ śukravāsare |

Ahlama]ṭhakeyoḥ | |

The MS is dated, according to the *amānta* scheme: Friday, December 15, 1419, when the 13th lunar day of the dark fortnight of Mārḡaśīrṣa ended about 2 h. 48 m. after mean sunrise at Laṅkā. This fits all criteria.<sup>58</sup> The second part of the colophon is more difficult to understand as it largely has peeled off. Some points of a more general interest, however, can be made.

The introduction of the writer, regardless of the sentence structure, is an older feature, repeated in the present version of the Lokaprakāśa which also employs the abbreviation *pre*, met with in many colophons. The dating is in Laukika Samvat without the century. Instead of the North Indian *śu di* or *bā di* designations for the bright and the dark half of the moon, the Kashmiri MSS always have *śu[kla] ti[thi]* and *va[hula] ti[thi]*.<sup>59</sup> The PS MS was copied in the famous *Ahalyā Maṭha* of Srinagar, by a member of the Mera [*Mīra*] clan already mentioned in the later Rājataranṅiṇī.

1660 A.D. *Kāśikāvṛtti* by Jayāditya and Vāmana, B. 283, A.D. 1660/61 (Bühler Coll., Poona)

śubham astu | | śrī-nṛpati-vikramādityarājyasya gatābdāḥ 1717 śrī saptarṣimate  
saṃvat 26 pauṣa ti 3 ravau tiṣṇanakṣatre saṃpūrṇa-samāpteti śubham astu  
lekhaṇāṭhakebhyah | | [=Dec. 9, 1660, Sunday]

1680 A.D. Paris Ṛcaka (MS. DEV 230)

om śrī gaṇeśāya namaḥ | | om śrī saṃvat 55 mārḡa va ti 15 caṃ  
55 caturthyam vṛ pu ge 7 caṃ 2 va di 12 śu śe ta kaṃ caṃ ra?  
11 pūtajirā 15 khyahāḥ siddhaḥ tatārcahādūkaṃ 5 paṇḍita hiraka° (add.,  
sec.manu: ṭinagatapaṭi 5)

If Paṇḍita Hiraka is identical with Bhaṭṭa Haraka, who lived in 1682 A.D., the date may correspond to 1680 A.D. However many of the abbreviations in this colophon remain unclear.<sup>60</sup>

1675 A.D.

A correctly dated, large birch bark Ṛcaka is that of Baron v. Hügel who acquired



it in the 1830's. It now is kept in the National Library of Vienna.<sup>61</sup> It is dated in the 18th year of Aurangzeb:

*śrīvikramādityaśākā 1732, śālivahana śāka 1597, śrīmadaurāṅgaśāhaśākā 18, śrīsaptarṣicāramatena saṁvat [47] 50 vai su ti 10 śanau | | śrī-pre-rajāna-vātike-sthita mayā dāsātīdāsa-dara-paṁdherakena ayam karmakāṇḍo vedapustakam sampāditam.*

This means that the MS was copied in April 1675 at Rājānavāṭikā,<sup>62</sup> i.e. Rāṇvōr (vulgo Rainavari), the suburb of Srinagar (pre)<sup>63</sup> on the Dal lake, by a certain Dasātīdāsa Dhara Pandhera (Pāṇḍe?), obviously a member of, or perhaps rather a *purohita* of the well-known Dar clan. It is, in fact, one of the latest, if not the last birch bark manuscripts that has come to light so far.<sup>64</sup>

We are somewhat recompensated for the lack in extensive colophons by the historical sense of many Kashmirian authors. They have included, among the last verses of their works, not only the exact date when they finished them but often even more information relating to their family, etc. In this way, we do not have to rely on the colophon of the first available MS., as frequently as in the case of other Indian texts, in order to get an idea about their age. This feature fails us, however, in the case of older, anonymous texts such as the Vedas, the Epic—and the Nīlamata Purāṇa. In such cases we can only rely on internal evidence in order to get an approximation of the date of the text.

## 5. Paper MSS

As has been indicated above, the paper manuscripts from Kashmir are younger than the birchbark MSS. Bühler wrote that “many of them have been written by Pandits, not by professional writers, and they are very correct and carefully done.” Indeed, many of the paper MSS are written carefully, often by interested persons, such as Paṇḍits who wanted to have a copy of their own of a particular text. A famous example is the well-known scholar of the 17th century, Rājānaka Ratnakaṇṭha, whom M.A. Stein describes in some detail in the introduction to his translation of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, p. 46 sq. He was famous for having copied a whole book while one of his friends was preparing a meal. Indeed, his handwriting, which is well-known from the facsimile page of the archetype of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, printed by Stein (but not included in the reprints), shows both the good and bad characteristics of Śāradā writing: the differences with Nāgarī, especially of certain ligatures which allow to correct North Indian MSS, but also the confusion for any reader caused by quickly written ligatures.



Just like the birchbark MSS, the Kashmiri paper MSS do not imitate the Indian palmleaf MSS but are cut in rectangular or often even almost square format. They come in all possible sizes, from large folio to miniature booklets of a few centimeters across. Such small books usually contain prayers of revered texts such as the Gītā (often with miniatures).<sup>65</sup>

The paper used normally is the “thick country paper” known from other parts of India, the only difference being that Kashmiris apparently liked to use colored paper and thus, some of the MSS of Vedic texts I have used showed a fair amount of scattered colored (reddish, blueish, etc.) leaves among the usual white or grey folios.

Bühler complained that “the roughness of the binding [in leather] and the absence of blank leaves at the beginning and the end have frequently caused the loss of these portions. A great many of them have also lost single letters by fraying. Sometimes, too, the Pandits cut bound volumes in order to get portions copied more conveniently, and some of the loose leaves fall out and disappear. The sense of order is not one of the qualities cultivated by the Kaśmīrian scholars.”

#### 6. Devanāgarī MSS

The Devanāgarī, or perhaps we should rather say, the Kashmiri Nāgarī manuscripts, again are younger than the Śāradā paper MSS. The oldest ones I have seen date back to the late 18th century. Bühler found that they were “written by professional scribes, the *Bāc-Bhaṭṭas*, and are, for this reason, even if they have been afterwards corrected by Pandits, less trustworthy than even Śāradā paper MSS. A good many mistakes remain, especially such as are caused by difficult Śāradā compound letters, and the best plan for restoring corrupt passages is to try to find the Śāradā ligature which most closely resembles the corrupt Devānāgarī group.” (cf. below)

Copying from Śāradā into Nāgarī thus automatically increased the chance for writing mistakes, even if the scribe knew both scripts perfectly well. Unconsciously, though, certain characters looking alike in both scripts but expressing different sounds frequently are confused.<sup>66</sup> In addition a number of ligatures of Śāradā are badly copied or even taken over from the Śāradā original into the Nāgarī MS. This is the case especially with some rare signs that have no longer any counterpart in Northern Indian Nāgarī, such as the Vedic *-l-* (for intervocalic *-ḍ-*, as in the beginning of the RV: *agnim īle purohitam*).<sup>67</sup> In this case, the Śāradā letter is transposed into Nāgarī *ḍ*, but the small diacritic triangle



always attached to the Śāradā letter to express the phonetic variant *-l-* is added to the Nāgarī *-ḍ-* as well. I mention this case because as *-l-* occurs in quite a number of texts but, nevertheless, usually has been ignored, misunderstood or simply neglected by the editors. A list of typical miswriting is found below.

### *Corrections and 'Cooking'*

Commenting on modern copying practises in his time Bühler writes: "As the Devanāgarī MSS are mostly prepared for the market, they also are not unfrequently 'cooked', i.e. the lacunae and defects in the original are filled in according to the fancy of the Pandit who corrects them." This feature, mentioned so prominently by Bühler, is perhaps not as common as he presents it. There probably existed a small "cottage industry" in his time as there already had been a demand by the Mahārājā for some 20 years who got many Kashmirian MSS copied for his Raghunāth Temple Library at Jammu.<sup>68</sup> Bühler's visit and his acquisitions for the Bombay Government<sup>69</sup> of course, further intensified this process. Cooking does not seem to be the case in the Vedic MSS, as hardly anybody (except Bühler) had an interest to buy them. Even the copies of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā that were made for the Mahārāja clearly show the lacunae of the original, as does the PS manuscript itself. Stein, however, mentions a crude colophon forgery in one of the old birch bark MSS he later presented to the Tübingen Library.<sup>70</sup>

Bühler continues: "This most objectionable habit prevails in Kaśmīr to a very great extent, perhaps to a greater extent than in India proper, though in India proper, too, the Pandit has little respect for the sacredness of the ancient texts. In no part of India I, however, have been told of the practice of restoring or 'cooking' Sanskrit manuscripts with so much simplicity as in Kaśmīr. I was asked by my friends if the new copies to be made for me were to be *made complete* or not."

Bühler then goes on to report the piece of information that has saved future Sanskritists working on the NM a lot of work in figuring out how the two recensions of the text available now had arisen: "and one of the Pandits confessed to me with contrition, after I had convinced him of the badness of the system, that formerly he himself had restored a large portion of the Viṣṇudharmottara. The passage from the Nīlamatapūrāṇa [printed in the appendix of Bühler's *Report*], gives a specimen of such a restoration. In that case the Mahārāja of Kaśmīr was the innocent cause of the the forgery. He ordered Pandit Sāhebrām to prepare a trustworthy copy of the Nīlamata for edition. As the Pandit found that all MSS were defective in the beginning, and as he knew from the fragments, as well as



from the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, what the lost portion did contain, he restored the whole work according to his best ability. If I had not come to Kaśmīr soon after his death, it is not improbable that the genuine text would have disappeared altogether. For the Pandits thought, until I convinced them of the contrary, Sāhebrām's copy greatly superior to all others."

"From these facts will appear that complete Kaśmīr MSS have to be used with care, especially if they are new and the older MSS are mutilated. But I do not wish to declare all complete Kaśmīrian MSS as untrustworthy, because in many cases complete MSS have been procured by collating a number of MSS mutilated in different places<sup>71</sup> or such MSS, as having been treated with great care, remained complete."

### *The Kashmirian Libraries*

We do not know about the libraries of the early kings of Kashmir, but we can assume that they had, just as important temples and some scholars, larger collections of texts. Whatever royal or temple libraries there may have been, however, all of them have disappeared without a trace, unless we want to trust local information and regard some of the dams in the Dal Lake as their remnants.<sup>72</sup> Furthermore, similar finds could probably be made from the wells of Śrīnagar mosques, which often had been temples before. It is said that figures of gods and also sealed pots with MSS were thrown into the wells at the time of persecutions, and it also whispered that indeed figures have been recovered from such wells and subsequently sold. It therefore would be a very interesting task for the Archaeology Department to execute a few test digs to see how much truth is contained in these old stories.

Unfortunately, under some of the early Sultans many MSS were indeed destroyed. The Rājatarāṅgiṇī of Śrīvara reports the destruction of books under Sikandar.<sup>73</sup> Zain ul Abīdīn is favorably compared with his father Sikandar. He brought the Sanskrit books (e.g. of the Purāṇās, logic, Mīmāṃsā) back from outside Kashmir and distributed them to the Brahmins (*purāṇa-tarka-mīmāṃsa-pustakān aparān api dūrād ānaya, vittena vidvadbhyaḥ pratyapādayat*). Zain ul Abīdīn also collected a large library which remained for more than one hundred years after his death until it was destroyed.<sup>74</sup>

Otherwise, we know little about the Brahmin libraries of the subsequent times, except from the Kashmiri MSS actually surviving until today, until Bühler's report who writes about the situation in 1875: "All the Sanskrit speaking Pandits, as well as some of the traders and officials, possess larger or smaller libraries. The twenty-two Pandits whose names are given below are stated to be the possessors of the most considerable collections." I have information adding to



this list from inquiries I made in 1979. Unfortunately, the developments of the last few years may have rendered this list somewhat academic as most Pandits seem to have left Srinagar for Jammu and other places in India.<sup>75</sup>

Bühler states<sup>76</sup> that he had himself inspected a half-dozen of these libraries and had got a list of most of the others but was not sure about their completeness. Furthermore, these were lists of the libraries of the best known Sanskrit scholars only. But many books were and are still in the hands of Muslim families, often former Brahmins, such as the Butt [Bhaṭṭa] families. I should, therefore, not be in the least astonished if, in future, important finds of ancient books were made in such families.

Indeed, M. A. Stein still found many interesting books during his many stays in the Valley. Fortunately, he sent most of them to the libraries of Vienna,<sup>77</sup> Tübingen, Berlin, Paris and especially to Oxford,<sup>78</sup> that is the large number of 212 MSS, where they are kept and are accessible in original and microfilm at the Bodleian Library. Later on, the Research Library of the Department of Archeology at Srinagar has collected some 8000 texts (contained in a lesser number of actual MSS). They are now housed in the Research Library of the University of Kashmir at Srinagar. The Pandits at the Library have prepared a short catalogue, a sort of handlist, but it remains unpublished. The first 212 numbers of this collection have been transported to Delhi<sup>79</sup> and they have remained there ever since, in the National Archives of India where they are kept almost inaccessible, as they are classified with actual government documents.

A larger number of MSS was bought by Lokesh Chandra for his Academy of Indian Culture, at New Delhi. He has begun to publish them in facsimile in the Śatapīṭaka Series. Another larger collection is in the National Museum at New Delhi; of this, there exists a card catalogue that equally remains unpublished. A number of Kashmiri MSS are at the VVRI & VISIS Institute at Hoshiarpur (formerly at the Dayanand College, Lahore); others are found at Allahabad and Khanpur. They are remnants of the large collections of emigrated Pandits in the former North-West Provinces.<sup>80</sup> Even the Osmania University at Hyderabad has a collection of Kashmir MSS (also collected from emigrated Pandits?). Due to the interests of Kielhorn and his position in the Bombay Government in the last century, a larger number of Kashmir MSS also found its way to the Library of the University of Göttingen, Germany. It should be repeated that MSS could and probably still can be found with Muslim owners whose ancestors had been Brahmins.<sup>81</sup> Still, they kept their Sanskrit MSS, at least still around 1900, quite jealously.

As mentioned above, the same applies to the expatriates who had settled,



especially since Afghani times (1756–1819), in the whole area from Lahore and Delhi up to Benares. In the N. W. Provinces and Oudh alone, the catalogue<sup>82</sup> compiled by Pt. Devī Prasāda in the eighties of the last century, listed, among many other types of texts, some 900 Kashmiri Veda MSS in private possession at Lucknow, Sitapur, Hardoi, Agra, Fyzabad, Gonda, Allahabad, etc. Some of them now are preserved in the Akhila Bharatiya Parisad at Lucknow; about the rest we do not know.

The custom of consigning old MSS to the rivers and lakes has already been referred to. Unfortunately, this seems to have been fairly common in Kashmir as well. As Bühler reports Pt. Cāndrām had “thrown the remnants of a birchbark copy of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī into the Jelum, as he thought that they were of no value. ... It is customary to throw remnants of books into the river, in order to preserve ‘the face of Sarasvatī’ from defilement. ... Similar practices prevail on the Ganges and other particular holy rivers.”<sup>83</sup> This still is the practise today in India proper.<sup>84</sup> The political situation being what it is now, it is difficult to speculate on the future of all the libraries mentioned above and on the fate of the collections traditionally held in the Muslim families. They may fall prey to fundamentalist tendencies now, a way of thought that never had appealed to the Kashmiris so far, during the more five hundred years of Muslim civilization in the Valley.

### §3 Śāradā script

We now come to the second major topic in this chapter, the local script of Kashmir, the Śāradā script. Apart from an early edition of the bible in Śāradā characters,<sup>85</sup> it was Rudolf von Roth who was interested in the Kashmirian Atharvaveda in the early seventies of the last century, and then especially again Bühler, who drew attention to the stores of ancient texts in Śāradā script kept in Kashmir. He writes: “All<sup>86</sup> *Bhūrja* MSS are written in the so-called Śāradā characters, an alphabet closely connected with that of the Guptas.”<sup>87</sup> ... The name *Śāradākṣarāṇi* means either ‘letters sacred to Śāradā’, i.e. Sarasvatī, or it may be taken as ‘the letters which are Sarasvatī,’ i.e. (visible) speech. Śāradā is considered one of the tutelary goddesses of the country, which frequently is named after her *Śāradādeśa* or *Śāradāmaṇḍala*. ... The Śāradā characters now in use appear first on the coins of Avantivarman (855–884 A.D.). The older coins of Toramāṇa and Pravarasena show pure Gupta characters.”

We can now add to this early assessment as B. K. Deambi Kaul has recently published a paleography of Śāradā script and the Śāradā inscriptions of the



Valley. In addition, handlists of Śāradā characters have been published by Burghardt,<sup>88</sup> Grierson,<sup>89</sup> Kaye,<sup>90</sup> Lore Sanders,<sup>91</sup> and K. R. van Kooij.<sup>92</sup> Furthermore, the complete Atharvaveda MS has been published in facsimile<sup>93</sup> and transliterated by Barret,<sup>94</sup> and B. K. Kaul Deambi has published a paleography of the script.<sup>95</sup> We are, thus, in a much better position to deal with the peculiarities of this still largely ignored script.<sup>96</sup> Bühler's following statement therefore has to be taken *cum grano salis*: "The Śāradā characters become, if they are written hastily, very difficult to read.<sup>97</sup> Written carefully, they are plain enough. They make the MSS particularly valuable for collation, because certain ligatures, e.g. *sy* and *sp*, which in Devanāgarī are very similar in appearance, become very unlike to each other in this character."

Śāradā retains some ancient characteristics lost in most other modern scripts, such as "the two spirants, called in Sanskrit, *Jihvāmūliya* and *Upadhmānīya*, *kh* and *ph* [i.e. *h* and *ḥ*, as they are normally written nowadays]. These two signs are hardly ever used in Devanāgarī MSS, except occasionally by the Jains [and in some South Indian MSS, which, however, only use one sign (*h*) for both sounds, as well as in the older Nepalese palmleaf MSS which have both signs]. They occur frequently enough in the inscriptions down to the 8th century of our era. But I have never seen them used as regularly as in the case of good Śāradā MSS. At present the Kaśmīrian Pandits do not pronounce the sounds which they indicate."<sup>98</sup>

### 1. Nāgarī script in Kashmir

Bühler wrote that "the Devanāgarī MSS written in Kaśmīr are all very modern. I was told that these characters had come into more general use during the last thirty years [i.e. 1845-1875] only, since the annexation of Kaśmīr to the Jamū dominions." This is not quite correct. The Berlin MS of the Kaṭha Saṃhitā, was bought somewhere in N. India already in the late 18th century by Sir Robert Chambers.<sup>99</sup>

It is written in the typical Kāśmīrī style of Devanāgarī which, as far as I know, has not been described yet anywhere. However, Bühler correctly reports that "this style of Devanāgarī is also found in the MSS, actually copied in Kaśmīr itself, viz., at Jamū, on orders of the Mahārāja [in the middle of the last century] for the collections at the Raghunāth Temple Library at Jamū. They resemble the general shape and writing style, though not the actual form of Śāradā letters."

In his time, the Pandits still could read even printed Devanāgarī only with difficulty. Nowadays, the opposite is the case. Some traditional Pandits still read Śāradā and the rest only Devanāgarī, if they do not use Urdū script.



#### §4 Writing mistakes

As has been pointed out in the introduction, writing mistakes in MSS stemming from Kashmir are due to the usual type of copying mistakes, caused by ambiguous characters or ligatures, etc., to misreading of older Śāradā characters, especially when copying Śāradā MSS into Devanāgarī, and to the influence of the Kashmiri pronunciation of Sanskrit.

How far the local pronunciation has influenced the spelling habits of the Kashmiri scribes is quickly revealed by a study of the modern pronunciation of Sanskrit in Kashmir. This has already been given in rudiments by Bühler<sup>100</sup> and is presented in some more detail below. If modern pronunciation is compared with mistakes in recent or even medieval Sanskrit MSS the influence of local pronunciation is obvious and strongly felt, more strongly in fact than in many other regions of South Asia. For the medieval period, however, such pronunciation features have to be reconstructed, as we should not extrapolate these features from modern evidence alone. Materials for such an investigation are the following.

(a) Pronunciation habits, which seem to underly contemporary MSS. A good example is the Paippalāda Saṃhitā (1519 A.D.) with its thousands of misspellings and its frequent “phonetical” writings of whatever the scribe or recitator had “in their ears”. This kind of evidence has to be used with caution, however, as we have to avoid circular argumentation. Other contemporary evidence is supplied by a study of the writing mistakes in the (critical) editions of various Vedic, classical and Epic texts, such as the Śakuntalā, Kumārasambhava, Bhagavadgītā, Mahābhārata, Tantrākhyāyikā, etc., which exhibit, however, fewer mistakes. Where they occur, they supply an even stronger argument supporting the evidence gained from a study of PS.

(b) Other texts that can be investigated are: the Mahanayaprakāśa<sup>101</sup> and the Lallāvākyāni,<sup>102</sup> both composed in early Kashmiri. However, as Lallā’s verses have been very popular, they have been transmitted orally and have been copied many times during the last few centuries; these MSS may therefore reflect the more recent trends in pronunciation.<sup>103</sup> A study of the older Sanskrit loanwords and the more recent *tadbhavas* in the Mahānayaprakāśa,<sup>104</sup> however, provides better evidence as the text was less popular and has been transmitted in writing. It also indicates the general trends of development from Sanskrit and the otherwise unattested Kashmiri Prākṛit to early Kashmiri.

(c) In order to countercheck the evidence gained from PS with other Vedic texts, a few older Kaṭha and Aitareya MSS have been excerpted for mistakes.



(d) As a starting point, and as counterbalance to the evidence from medieval MSS, a short description of the modern pronunciation of Sanskrit is given below. It is based on the analysis of modern Kashmiri Veda recitation (to be published elsewhere)<sup>105</sup> but this differs very little of course, from the pronunciation of Sanskrit in general.<sup>106</sup>

## §5 Modern and medieval pronunciation of Sanskrit<sup>107</sup>

Interestingly, it was already Bühler who had stressed, in his *Report*, that the local pronunciation of Sanskrit in Kashmir differed very much from that in the various parts of India proper. As the Inspector of Education in the Bombay province, he had travelled widely, from Bombay to Gujarat, Karṇāṭaka and beyond, but he had not come across such a divergent type of pronunciation. Actually, Kerala or even Bengali pronunciation does not affect the shape of Sanskrit words as much as Kashmiri pronunciation does. Bühler therefore complained: "The influence of the country dialect has affected the pronunciation also in a very high degree, so much so that during the first days I found great difficulty in making out what my visitors said..." He summed up his impression of the changes that Sanskrit sounds are subjected to in Kashmir in a few rules.<sup>108</sup>

As we will see, his observations cover quite a good part of the many changes that are typical for Kashmiri Sanskrit and Veda pronunciation, and scholars would have benefited much if they had better heeded his advice: "A knowledge of these Kaśmirian peculiarities is of the greatest importance for the students who use MSS. from Kaśmīr, as they explain a great number of mistakes. Thus *o* occurs frequently for *u*, *e* for *i*, *da* for *dha*, *ba* for *bha*, *g* for *gha*, and *kkhya* or *khyā* for *kṣa*."<sup>109</sup> Only some of Bühler's observations have been used by Sanskritists who have utilized MSS from Kashmir in their editions.

### 1. Modern Pronunciation of Sanskrit

#### VOWELS<sup>110</sup>

a	[a, ʌ, ä, ə, ə: a:, i, e:, u, ɔ, o, o:, ə, φ]	(N.B. φ = zero, disappearance)
ā	[a:, ä:, ə:, o:, ɔ:, ε]	
i/ī	[i, i:, e, e:, ye, a, ya, yi-]	C+i [C+ya]
u/ū	[u, u:, ə, ə:, ɔ, ɔ:, o, o:, ü, a, ʌ, ä, u, ə, φ; vo-, uo-]	C+u [C+va]
ṛ	[rə, re, ra, rʰ]	
ḷ	[le]	
e	[e, e:, i, i:, ye, ye:, ya, i, u, φ; ye-, yi-]	
o	[o:, u, u:, a]	



ai [ai, ε<sup>i</sup>, ε]

au [au, ao, o]

### CONSONANTS

gh [g]	c [t <sup>s</sup> , c]	ñ [n, ñ]
dh [d]	ch [t <sup>sh</sup> , ch]	ṇ [n, ṇ]
bh [b]	j [z, j]	-l- [ḍ, r, l]

y [y, i]	-y- [ϕ]	y- [ϕ, i-]
v [v, u]	-r- [ϕ]	v- [ϕ, u-]
vr- [r]	-v- [ϕ]	

ś, ṣ [ṣ]      -hr- [ḥr]

he [çe]      -h- [ϕ]

hi [çi]

clusters:

kṣ [ky, kṣ]	Cy [C]	hm [m]
jñ [gñ, gy]	Cr [C]	hṇ [n]
	Cv [C]	

CC [C]

### Sandhi forms:

ah } [a:] (and the other vowels, in the same way: i:, u:)  
ah  
ah

aṁ } [ām, aṇ, aN, am, a]  
ām

-ś ś-  
-ṣ ṣ-  
-s s- } retained in pronunciation and writing

-n + nasal [-d + nas.]

Effects of quick recitation (*allegro* forms):



vowels: often >  $\phi$ <sup>111</sup>

or *mātra* vowel [<sup>a</sup>, <sup>ə</sup>, <sup>i</sup>, <sup>u</sup>, <sup>ī</sup>]

c	[s]	p	[ <sup>u</sup> ]	-y-	[ $\phi$ ]	y-	[ $\phi$ ]	s	[š]
ch	[t]			-r-	[ $\phi$ ]	v-	[ $\phi$ ]	ts	[s]
n	[r]	m	[r]	-v-	[ $\phi$ ]	rC	[C]	st	[s]

### SYNOPSIS

Variants of quick recitation are given in ( ) brackets; ^ indicates lengthened vowel, ~ nasalized vowel; occasional variants in writing are given in < > brackets.

	Phoneme	Realisation	Graphemes
Velars	K	k	k
	KH	kh, k	kh
	G	g	g gh
Dental Affricates	C	t <sup>s</sup> c (s)	c
	CH	t <sup>sh</sup> t <sup>s</sup> ch; (t)	ch
	J	z j	j jh
Retroflexes	Ṭ	ṭ (t)	ṭ
	ṬH	ṭh ṭ (th)	ṭh
	Ḍ	ḍ	ḍ ḍh
	(Ḍ)	ḍ r l	ḍ <ḍ>
Dentals	T	t	t
	TH	th t	th
	D	d	d dh
Labials	P	p ( <sup>u</sup> )	p
	PH	ph p	ph
	B	b <sup>u</sup> /β (p)	b bh
Resonants	N	n ṇ ñ N~ $\phi$ (ṇ, y, r)	n ṇ ñ ṇ ṁ
	M	m N n o (r)	m ṁ ṁ
	Y	y <sup>i</sup> $\phi$ (i-)	y
	R	r $\phi$ ^ s ś	r ḥ ḥ ḥ ś ś s
	L	l	l
	V	v <sup>u</sup> $\phi$ (u-)	v
Sibilants	Ś	ś (d)	ś s
	S	s ś ^ r (ś)	s ḥ h h ś ś s
Glottal Affricate	H	h ɟ ḥ $\phi$	h
SANDHI	Ȳ	~y my ~my y	my myy
	Ṛ	~r mr	mr ṁr
	Ḽ	~l	ṁll ṁll ṁl
	Ṽ	~v v	ṁv ṁvv
	(SCH)	tt <sup>sh</sup> t <sup>sh</sup> t <sup>s</sup>	cch <sch>



## 2. Modern Kashmiri pronunciation

The sound system of modern Kashmiri has been described by Morgenstierne<sup>112</sup> according to some field notes. His system differs considerably from those of Grierson and Kaul. Part of this may be due to the fact that the “Muslim” and the “Brahmin” dialects differ from each other and that the rural areas, too, deviate. Also, Morgenstierne based his observations only on a single person.

	Notes
k kh      g	
c ch      j ñ	j > ž, sometimes
č čh      ž	č > s, sometimes (probl. dialectic), but cf. above (PS)!
ṭ ṭh      ḍ	
t th      d n	
p ph (f?)      b m	
r (ṛ) l      v y	r > ṛ in village dialects; vr- in a few tatsama <sup>113</sup>
s š h	š in initial position z voiced dental affricate -h often > φ
CLUSTERS:	aspirate + r (rare)
C + y	Cya = ca [ce] /c <sup>y</sup> e/
C + ry > Cr	(often simplified)
Conditioned variants in an earlier stage of Kashmiri: t <sup>u</sup> > č <sup>u</sup> became phonemic when c > č kh <sup>y</sup> > ch <sup>y</sup> ditto when k <sub>s</sub> > čh > ch or new phonemes: d, ḍ, l > j (in certain conditions)	

I add Morgenstierne’s table of conditioned consonant changes due to *mātra* vowels, simplified from Grierson.<sup>114</sup>

	t	d	n	ṭ	ḍ	k	g	l	h
When followed by :									
ü <i>mātra</i>	č	z	ñ			c	j	j	š
i				c	j				
y, e	č	z	ñ	c	j	c	j	j	š

A comparison of the analysis of Morgenstierne and the recordings of modern Veda recitation and of modern Sanskrit pronunciation underlines the far-reaching overlap in the results of both investigations: For example, the two series of dental



and palatal affricates in modern Kashmiri are reflected by the insecurity of the reciters which of both series to chose in the case of Sanskrit *c*, *ch*, *j* (*jh*):

*c ch*      *j*  
*ç çh*      *ž*

This is, however, of no importance for the representation in writing, except for those cases (mostly restricted to the Paippalāda Saṃhitā), where *c* is represented by *c*, *ts*, *t*, *s*. A certain insecurity in chosing between retroflexes and dentals is also seen. It is, however, little represented in the lists of writing mistakes provided below.<sup>115</sup> I also heard many more varieties of nasal sounds than Morgenstierne noted; this may be due to the Vedic texts involved and also due to the fact that Morgenstierne's informant was a Muslim whose dialect differs somewhat from the Brahmanical one.<sup>116</sup>

Some of the conditioned changes involving *mātra* vowels seem to reflect the strange vacillation found in the Kashmir MS<sup>117</sup> of PS:

*c~t~s~ts*

*j~d~(z)~(dz)*

(Cf. also *i<sup>ü</sup>>c<sup>ü</sup>* which became phonemic when *c>ç*; *kh<sup>y</sup>>ch<sup>y</sup>*; of *k*, *g*, *l*, *h* followed by *mātra* vowel).

### 3. Pre-15th-century Pronunciation of Sanskrit

A general picture of medieval Sanskrit pronunciation can be observed in the changes that names have undergone, from Sanskrit to Prākṛit to early Kashmiri, in Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī.<sup>118</sup> These reflect the changes that Sanskrit pronunciation of place names and personal names must have undergone in Kashmir between the first few centuries A.D. when these Sanskrit names were first given and 1150 A.D. when the Rājatarāṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa was completed.

Even in Kalhaṇa's time the ambiguity between forms such as Cakka/Cakra, Gagga/Garga, Laḥkhana/Lakṣ(m)aṇa, -siṃha/-siha was still felt. Kalhaṇa freely alternates between the Sanskrit and Prākṛit forms.

In other cases, explained in some detail in the chapter of this book dealing with the Kashmirian Brahmins, the forces of Sanskritization, and at the same time, those of Prākṛitization can be felt.<sup>119</sup>

Some such cases of Prākṛitization are seen in the following place names;<sup>120</sup>

Levāra < \*Ledarī-agrahāra

Kuruhāra < \*Kuru-agrahāra

Khāgi < \*Khāgendrī, or \*Khagendra-purī<sup>121</sup>

Godharā-Hastisālā < \*Godharā-hastisālā=agrahāra<sup>122</sup>

Jālorā < \*Jānaka-purā<sup>123</sup>



*Śamāṅgāsā*,<sup>124</sup> *Śanāra*<sup>125</sup> < \**Śacīnara-pura*<sup>126</sup>

*Surendra*; *Soraka*<sup>127</sup>; *Saurasa-vihāra*<sup>128</sup>

The early onset of Prākṛit forms is surprising. While Kalhaṇa still reports both Sanskrit and Prākṛit forms, the complete loss of one or more syllables in the case of the place names can only be explained by *allegro* forms<sup>129</sup> based on the local Prākṛit or, at least, Old Indo-Aryan names that automatically underwent Prākṛit developments<sup>130</sup>—before Sanskrit was made the official language in the Valley sometime during the first few centuries A.D.<sup>131</sup> Other cases where even Kalhaṇa still shows Prākṛit influence, are the variants of personal names Gaggacandra/Gargacandra, etc.

Cases of Sanskritization include names such *Gauramūlaka* which is reported as *Ghora/Gaura-mūlaka* by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa,<sup>132</sup> in Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 8.1681, and in Kṣemendra's *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* 18.71; or names such as those in *-muṣa*: *Khonamuṣa*, founded by king Khagendra<sup>133</sup> is of special interest, as it represents, together with names such as *Katīmuṣa* (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 2.55) and *Rāmuṣa agraḥāra* (2.55)<sup>134</sup> a level of place names that is not readily explained by Sanskrit or Middle Indian etymologies. The meaning of the "suffix" *muṣa/muṣa* is unclear, as a connection with Skt. *muṣ* 'to steal' is unlikely; it may represent a pre-Indo-Aryan substrate.

These and many other place names thus are likely to indicate an earlier level of settlement,<sup>135</sup> and some of them may reflect the substrate, that is the original language of the Valley, of people called "Nāgas" and "Piśācas" by the Nīlamata Purāṇa.

The development of these place names is, as everywhere in India, indicative of the sound changes underlying the development from Old to New Indo-Aryan, be it that certain peculiarities such as the effects of quick speech (*allegro forms*) are more pronounced in these words than in non-appellative words.<sup>136</sup>

#### 4. Mahānayaprakāśa

An important source for the form of non-appellative words in early Kashmiri is the Mahānayaprakāśa.<sup>137</sup> As usual, the text contains not only words in early Kashmiri that have undergone all the sound changes from Old Indo-Aryan to NIA (*tadbhava*) but also a large share of words that have been taken over from Sanskrit at the time of the author or slightly before this. These *tatsama* words present a good indication of the way Sanskrit was pronounced at the time of the author, in the fifteenth century.

Grierson has investigated this text in great detail.<sup>138</sup> For the present purpose, only the relevant facts about medieval pronunciation are extracted and



compared with evidence gleaned from other sources. It will be seen that many peculiarities of Kashmiri pronunciation have not changed very much until today. On the other hand, many of these traits are reflected by even earlier evidence; they can be made use of when trying to understand early (i.e. first millennium) mistakes in the transmission of texts such as the NM and some of their attempts to Sanskritize local names.

The author of the *Mahānayaparakāṣa*, Śitikaṇṭha or Śitikaṇṭhācārya, was also the author of a *Bālabodhinīnyāsa*, a commentary of the *Apāśabdanirākaraṇa*, both grammatical works of his ancestor (Kavīndra) Jagaddhara (c. 1350–1400 A.D.)<sup>139</sup> According to Grierson, Śitikaṇṭha states in the introduction to his *Nyāsa* that he wrote it under Husain Śāh, the son of Haidar Śāh, in L.S. 4583=1482 A.D. This work therefore provides a welcome insight into the development of the Kashmiri language and its pronunciation in the 15th century.

As mentioned above, in the present context, a study of the *tadsama* words is especially useful as they indicate the pronunciation of the period. But the *tadbhava* words are interesting as well: they indicate not only how the sounds of Sanskrit words or of early Sanskrit loans into the Kashmiri Prākṛit had developed by this time but they also reflect what kind of mistakes we can expect in the centuries before the composition of this text. The insecurity involved is clearly seen, as has been mentioned, in Kalhaṇa's treatment of certain names such as *Garga* and *Gagga*. *Gagga* is, of course, the younger form, normal by the time of the *Mahānyāyaparakāṣa*.

Unlike the *vākyāni* of Lallā, which are about one hundred years older but which have been transmitted orally and consequently have changed their phonetical shape by perseveration and modernization, the *Mahānyāyaparakāṣa* was transmitted in written form. It therefore represents the Kashmiri of the 15th century much more faithfully than Lallā's texts.

For our purpose precisely this point is important as we can use it as a countercheck of the phonetic tendencies found in MSS such as the birchbark MS of the *Paippalāda Saṁhitā* (PS) and in other Vedic MSS written about the same time (*R̥gveda*, *Kaṭha Saṁhitā*, the various *Kaṭha Ṛcakas*, see above). From among all the Vedic and classical MSS, the case of PS is especially interesting. As has been discussed elsewhere,<sup>140</sup> the writer or scribe of the original MS in Śāradā of the *Paipp. Saṁh.* apparently tried to "transcribe" the often corrupt passages of the text "phonetically correctly", that is according to the Kashmiri pronunciation of his time. This is understandable when the belief in the power of *mantras*, especially as developed in Tantric religion, is taken into account,—the more so, in the case of a text which aims at black and white magic. Exact



pronunciation is of supreme importance in order to reach the aim of the stanza used as well as to avoid unwished for consequences.<sup>141</sup>

The only point that might obstruct our purpose of understanding the Kashmiri pronunciation of the 15th century, and one not mentioned by Grierson, is that the two MSS of the Mahānyāyaprakāśa<sup>142</sup> available then have come down from a line of copies. During this process some mistakes reflecting later medieval or recent sound changes and/or habits might have crept in. However, as we shall see, the evidence of this text fits the one provided by the Vedic MSS so well that it is possible to draw up a list of peculiarities of pre-15th century pronunciation which, in turn, provides a large body of materials that allow to compare the “mine of blunders”<sup>143</sup> contained in the birchbark MS of PS. Since the present section is not intended to provide a discussion of early Kashmiri, I merely report the results of Grierson, who lists, in great detail, the developments from Sanskrit, via Prākṛit and Apabhraṃśa to the language of the MNP. I quote his paragraph numbers and compare some of the evidence from modern Veda recitation, the manuscript of PS, and some other medieval classical and Vedic MSS.

##### 5. Mistakes in Vedic and Classical MSS

From among the Vedic MSS stemming from Kashmir, evidence from PS, KS, KaṭhB, AĀ,<sup>144</sup> has been used. For KS, only Ṛcaka MSS have been utilized here, and not the manuscript Chambers (Ch) as it is written in Nāgarī; they are quoted according to the pages in Schroeder’s ed.; L is a paper Ṛcaka with glosses by ‘A<sub>2</sub>’, the glossator Bhaṭṭa Haraka, who lived in the middle of the 17th century<sup>145</sup>. It is notable that certain texts, such as KaṭhĀ, which evidently represents an older (c. 15th c.) tradition of recitation and writing have only a few mistakes.

It has to be stated at the outset that many writing mistakes are due to ambiguities, in the scribe’s mind, between two possible choices. For example, as there are no voiced occlusives (*mediae*) in Kashmiri, a scribe would never be sure whether to write, for example, *Ghora°* or *Gaura°* for the place name, variously attested,<sup>146</sup> of [Goramūlaka]. The same can apply, depending on the knowledge or the attention of the scribe, even to well known Sanskrit words. Thus, we can expect spellings like *Kuśmāṇḍa* for the well known text in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (TĀ 2), *Kuṣmāṇḍa*. On the other hand, as [ś] = [ṣ] in pronunciation [ṣ̌], we can also expect the reverse (for example *ṣiva* for *śiva*). Such reverse or ‘retrograde’ spellings are very common in various Kashmiri MSS, as will be seen below.



Mistakes in Vedic MSS (and some of Classical Skt.), correlated with MNP.

MNP	Kalhaṇa (personal and place names) <and other early evidence from inscriptions, literature, Vedic MSS>
<b>VOWELS:</b>	
1. a- > $\phi$	a > $\phi$ ved.
2. u- > $\phi$	
3. ē- > $\phi$	
4. h- > $\phi$	
5. -a- > ā	a > ā <sup>147</sup> a > ā Ved. ja > je ji > ja a > ō <sup>148</sup> a > i Ved. a > u Ved. -a > $\phi$ <sup>149</sup>
6. -a- > i	
7. -aḥ > u, a	
8. -am > u, a	
9. -aya- > e	
10. ā- > a	-ā- > ā <sup>150</sup> ā > a Ved. ā > a Ved.
11. -ā- > a	
12. -ā > a	
13. -ā- > ō	-ā- > ō <sup>151</sup> -ā- > -a <sup>152</sup> -ā > - $\phi$ <sup>153</sup> -i- > i, $\phi$ <sup>154</sup> -i > $\phi$ <sup>155</sup> i > e Ved. i > a Ved. -i- > ya PSK 1.47.2
15. -i > a	
16. -iḥ > a, i	
17. -iṃ > a	
18. -ī > a	



19. -ī	> i	ī	> i Ved.
			> u Ved.
20. -ī-	> e	PSK 1.99.3	
		ī	> e Ved.
		-u-	> u <sup>156</sup>
21. -u	> a	u	> a Ved.
22. -u-	> a		
23. u-	> o	u	> o Ved.
24. -ū-	> a > mod. <sup>a</sup>	(both interchange in mod. Kashm.!)	
-ū-	> ü: > mod. ü:		
25. ɾ-	> ri	ɾ	> re Ved.
		ri	> ɾ Ved.
26. -ɾ-	> i	ɾ	> ya Ved.
		-ɾ-	> āɾ PSK 1.58.2
		retrograde āɾ	> ɾ (inscr.) <sup>157</sup>
		-ara	> ɾ PSK 1.99.3
		-i-	> ɾ retrogr. PS 1.86.4
27. -i-	> i		
28. e	> e		
e	> yu		
29. -e	> a		
30. -e	> i	e	> i Ved.
		e	> ī Ved.
		e	> ai Ved.
		e	> a Ved.
31. -e-	> a	1428 A.D.: ai [ī] <sup>158</sup>	
		-ai	> i PSK 1.60.2 (retrograde)
		-āya	> e PSK 1.95.4
		e	> o Ved.
		ái	> á Ved.
		ai	> e Ved.
		-o-	> o <sup>159</sup>
32. o	> o	o	> a Ved.
-o-	> a	o	> ā ved.
		o	> e Ved.
		o	> u Ved.
33. -au-	> o	9th-12th cent. A.D.:	
		Gauramūlaka=Ghoramūlaka	



Special cases:<sup>160</sup>

(Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, Kalhaṇa, Bilhaṇa)

-au	>	- ū PSK 1.60.2
-aṃ	>	aḥ Ved. (writing mistakes)
-āṃ	>	ē Ved.
-aṃ	>	ān Ved.
-aṃ	>	-o Ved.
-mo	>	maṃ Ved.
-aṃ	>	ā Ved.
tām	>	tāṃ Ved.
-aṃ	>	am Ved.
-āṃ	>	ā Ved.
-aḥ	>	a Ved.
-āḥ	>	ā Ved.
-ā	>	aḥ Ved.
-hā	>	ghaḥ Ved.

34. metathesis: *yadi* > *yida*, *gauravam* > *guravvama*

35. summary:

a-	>	ϕ
i, u	>	a
ū	>	a / a / ū:
i, ī	/	e
u	/	o

ī > e PSK 1.99.3

iṃh > iḥ<sup>161</sup>

The rest as in Apabhraṃśa

CONSONANTS:

k / g 1x

k / kh 1x

36. aspirated voiced consonants

gh > g

(Pañcatantra, (PT))<sup>162</sup>

PT

unaspirated consonants

= mod. pron.

<7/9th c. A.D. *Ganuta* : *Ghanuta*><sup>163</sup>

<9/11th c. *Gauramūlaka*<sup>164</sup> = *Ghoram*>

(Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, Bilhaṇa, Kalhaṇa)

g / gh 3x PT

= mod. pron.

j > jh retrograde, PSK 1.98.3

ch / jh 1x PT<sup>165</sup>

= mod. pron.<sup>166</sup>

jh > j

ḍh > ḍ



dh > d = mod. pron.  
d / dh 23x PT<sup>167</sup>

bh > b = mod. pron.  
b / bh 11x PT<sup>168</sup>

(and vice versa, retrograde writings: d > dh)

### 37. weak aspiration of unvoiced aspirate consonants:

ṣṭh > ṣṭ <this is a mistake as both clusters are not distinguished in writing>

ṣṭ > ṣṭha (retrograde)  
occasionally:

ph > p

c / ch 2x PT

bh / p 3x PT (!)

### Initial and intermediate consonants

38. -k- > φ

-k- > k, g, φ<sup>169</sup>

-kh- > kh<sup>170</sup>

-g- > g<sup>171</sup>

39. -c- > φ

c- > sut PSK 1.292d

j > d PSK 1.23.2d

-ṭ- > r<sup>172</sup>

-ṭṭ- > ṭṭ<sup>173</sup>

-ṭs > śc PSK 1.86.4

40. -ṭh- > ḍh

ṭ / ṭh see ṣ + ṭ PT

-ṭh- > r<sup>174</sup>

-ḍ- > r<sup>175</sup>

-ḍ- > t PSK 1.95.1

ḷh > ḍḍh Ved.

41. -ṇ- > n

42. -t- > φ

-t- > c PSK 1.44.2

43. -t- > d (in monosyllable)

-t > d PSK 1.101.1

t > d 7x PT

t > ḍ PT

-t- > t (even in *tadbhava*)



	ta	>	jaḥ / ṇaḥ PT
	tī	>	cī Pt
	t / th	10 PT	
	t	>	n PT
	-th-	>	th <sup>176</sup>
	th / dh	1x PT	
	th / d	1 PT	
44. -d-	>	ϕ	
	>	y	
45. -d-	>	ḍ	
	-d-	>	j PSk 1.86
	-d-	>	t PSK 1.18.4d
	-n-	>	n
	dh	>	d PSK 1.46.5
	dh	>	th PSK 1.98.4
	dhāms	>	tānts Ved.
46. -n-	>	ñ	(when followed by palatal vowel)
	-n-	>	n <sup>177</sup>
	n-	>	d PSK 1.46.5
	ṇā	>	nā Ved.
	ṇā	>	na Ved.
47. -p-	>	v	
	-p-	>	v <sup>178</sup>
	-p-	>	-v- Ved.
	p / b	1x PT	
	p / ph	1x PT	
	-bh-	>	b <sup>179</sup>
	-bh-	>	p PSK 1.66.1
	-m-	>	m <sup>180</sup>
48. -m-	>	ḥ	(vame° a- -vaḥ a°) Ved.
	-m-	>	ṃm Ved.
	ma	>	pa (writing mistake) Ved.
	y-	>	j <sup>181</sup>
	ya	>	ha Ved.
	yī	>	ya Ved.
	-ya-	>	i (in Gāndhāri Dhp.)
	-r-	>	r <sup>182</sup>
	r	>	ri Ved.
	-r-	>	l inscr. <sup>183</sup>



		-l-	>	l <sup>184</sup>
		lo	>	ro Ved.
		li	>	ri Ved.
49. v-	>	v		-v- > v <sup>185</sup>
				v / p 1x PT
50. -va-	>	u		śv > śu PSK 1.60.2,
-va	>	u		śv > su PSK 1.82.2
				-v- > bh PSK 1.23.2d
51. ś-	>	h		-ś- > h <sup>186</sup>
				ś > ṣ Ved. and other MSS <sup>187</sup>
-ś-	>	h		śe > śi Ved.
				śi > śa Ved.
				ś > ch Ved.
mś	>	ḥ		
52. ṣ	>	ś		ś > ṣ PSK 1.60.21, 1.70.1
				1050 / 1150 / 1428 A.D.:
				Khonamuṣa : Khonamuśa
				(Bilhaṇa) (Kalhaṇa) <sup>188</sup>
				ṣ > ś Ved. and other MSS <sup>189</sup>
ṣ	>	h		
				-s- > s <sup>190</sup>
				s- > ś PSK 1.86.3
				-s- > ṣ PSK 1.98.3
				s > p writing mistake? Ved.
<i>Final consonants:</i>				
53. -k	>	ga		
54. -k	>	ϕ		
55. -t	>	ϕ		
-t	>	da (monosyll.)		
				-ṭh > r
				-m > ϕ PSK 1.85.4
				-s > ϕ <sup>191</sup>

*Clusters:*

56. Prākritic / Apabhraṃśa assimilation is typical:

57. -kt-	>	tt		
				kṣ > ḥkh <sup>192</sup>



		-ḍv-	>	mb
		-ṇḍ-	>	ṇḍ
58. -tk-	>	kk		
59. -tp-	>	pp		
60. -tth-	>	th		
		tta	>	ta Ved.
		ttām	>	tām Ved.
		-th-	>	th
61. -dg-	>	g		
62. -dgh	>	gh [g]		
63. -dgh-	>	ggh [gg]		
64. -dbh-	>	bbh [bb]		
		dbr	>	mbr Ved.
		dhru	>	bru (writing mistake? Ved.)
		-n-	>	n
65. -pt-	>	tt		
66. -pt-	>	t		
		pso	>	psva (retrograde!) Ved.
		mbhā	>	mbā Ved.
		bhya	>	tya (writing mistake, Ved.)

67. nasal+cons. mostly preserved (in Tatsamas)

*aṅga, aṇḍa, anta, bindu, kampana, amba*

		-ṇḍ-	>	ṇḍ <sup>193</sup>
68. -nt-	>	nd		
69. -nti-	>	-na (3rd pl. of verbs)		
70. -nth-	>	ṇḍ		
71. -ndr-	>	nd (see § 109)		
		-ndhr	>	nd
		nna	>	na Ved.
		mṇā	>	mṇā Ved.
		mne	>	mṇe (retrograde!) Ved.

72. cons.+nasal effects the following changes:

73. -gn-	>	gg		
74. -jñ-	>	ñ		
75. -pna-	>	nu		
		śna	>	śa Ved.
		sthñ-	>	st PSK 1.87.2
76. -tm-	>	p (in ātman-)		



77. -dm- > mm	dhm > dham PSK 1.83.3 <sup>194</sup>
78. -rm- > mm, m (see § 98)	
79. clusters of two nasals:	
-nm- > mm	
-nm- > m	mn > nn Ved.
80. clusters with other resonants ("semi-vowels"):	
C+y:	-C+y- > C+ϕ <sup>195</sup>
	-C+y- > CC?
	nya > ni PSK 1.112.5
khyeya / ā > khyi	
81. jy- > j	
82. -ty- > tt (except.).	
-ty- > cc	> t <sup>s</sup> (c) in mod. Kashmiri
	dy > jj ? <sup>196</sup>
	tya > ti Ved.
	ty > dy PSK 1.111.2
-kty- > cc	
-tty- > cc	
-rty- > -c-	
-ty- > d (except.)	te > tye (retrograde!) Ved.
83. -dy- > j, jj > z (mod. Kashm.)	
84. -dhy- > j, jj	
85. -ny- > ñ, ññ	na > nya (retrograde!) Ved
	pya > pa Ved
86. (a secondary development)	
87. -ry- > j	rya > rye Ved.
	rva > rvyā (retrograde!) Ved.
88. -vy- > -v-	vy- > vi PSK 1.66.1
	vy- > ve PSK 1.86.5
	śyā > śa Ved.
	-sy- > ss (early Kashm.) <sup>197</sup>
	syū > sū Ved.
	r+C > CC
89. C+r:	
preceding:	
-rg- > g, gg	rg > gg <sup>198</sup>



-rgh-	>	gg, ggh [gg]		
90. -rc-	>	cc		
91. -rj-	>	jj	rj	> jj <sup>199</sup>
92. -rñ-	>	n, nn		
			rm	> mm? <sup>200</sup>
93. -rt-	>	tt		
-rtm-	>	t		
94. -rth-	>	th		
95. -rdh-	>	ddh [dd]		
96. -rdhv-	>	d, dh [d]		
97. -rpy-	>	pp		
98. -rm-	>	m, mm		
99. -ry-	>	-j-		
100. -rl-	>	ll		
101. -rv-	>	vv		
102. -ršt-	>	tt (if <i>patta</i> < Avest. <i>paršti</i> )		
Svarabhakti (in Tatsama)				
103. -rd-	>	rad		
-rś-	>	riś, raś		
-rṣ-	>	riś, raś		
C+r:			Cr	> C+ϕ
104. kr-	>	k		
105. -kr-	>	k, kk		
106. gr-	>	g	gr-	> g <sup>201</sup>
107. -ñkr-	>	ñk		
108. tr-	>	t	tra	> tapa / upa Ved.
-tr-	>	tt		
109. -dr-	>	-d-		
-ndr-	>	-nd-		
-ndhr-	>	-nd-		
110. pr-	>	p (normal)		
pr-	>	pr (often)		
-pr-	>	p		
111. Svarabhakti:				
pr-	>	par		
112. bhr-	>	bh-	-śr-	> h <sup>202</sup>



*C+l*

113. -kl- > kal  
114. tall- > tul  
115. plu- > pala  
116. -rl- > ll

*C+v*

117. jv- > j  
-jjv- > -jj-  
118. -ḍv- > v, vv  
119. tvī- > ci-  
-tv- > -p-  
120. dv- > v, b [b]  
dvi- > du, dau  
dv- > j

121. -rv- > vv (cf. <sup>101</sup>)

*Sibilant clusters*

122. -śc- > tt?  
(cf. § 102: <\*-rśt-)  
123. śm- > m-  
124. śy- > ś, śś  
125. -śr- > ś, śś  
126. -śr- > sr (once)  
127. -śv- > ś  
128. -rś- > riś, raś  
129. -ṣṭ- > ṣṭh  
130. -ṣṭh- > ṭh  
131. -ṣp- > pp  
132. -ṣm- > ph - h- (once)  
133. -ṣy- > ś

- vr- > r PSk 1.29.1c  
hru > hū Ved.

- ly- > lh<sup>203</sup>  
-ly- > l<sup>204</sup>

- ḍv- > mb<sup>205</sup>

- tv > t PSK 1.95.1, 1.98.4

- dvi > vi PSK 1.108.3

- bhva > bhu Ved.

- śv > ṣu PSk 1.60.2,

- śv > su PSK 1.82.2

- dhm > dham PSK 1.83.3<sup>206</sup>

- śca > ca Ved.

(as in mod. pronunciation)

- śvā > śā Ved.

(see § 103)

(probably a Śāradā mistake)



134. -rṣ-	>	riś, raś	ṣve > ṣu Ved. (see § 103)
135. sk-	>	kh	
136. skh-	>	kh	
137. sth-	>	th	
138. sth-	>	ṭh	
139. sp-	>	ph	
140. sp-	>	p	
141. sph-	>	ph	
142. sm-	>	m	
143. -sy-	>	s	
144. sv-	>	s	su > sva (retrograde!) Ved.
-sv-	>	ss	sst > st Ved.
145. kṣ	>	kṣ	
clusters with h			
146. -hm-	>	mm	
hr-	>	h	hn > hamn PSK 1.18.3c

#### Sandhi

147. (A special case)

Summary:<sup>208</sup>

149. variation of dentals and retroflexes (dentals are preferred);

-d / ḍ-, -n / ṇ-

150. retention of single intervocalic consonant:

-§ 43: -t- > d

-t- > t

§ 55: -t > da

(monosyll.)

-jñ, ny > ñ

151. The Pkt. / Apabh. rule of doubling a cons. if one part of the cluster is elided is not strictly followed (normal: *bhākta* and *bhatta* > *bhatta* in Pkt.; later: both forms > *bhāta* (with lengthening of vowel))

153. Thus: *madhya* > *majja* / *maja*

*anya* > *añña* / *aña*

*viśramya* > *viśśāmeta* / *viśāmeta*

154. These variations partly depend on the meter, but Grierson believes that also, in the language of the author, all forms were found next to each other,



while in modern Dardic (incl. Kashmiri), the original length of the vowel is preserved next to a simplified consonant cluster with one consonant.

*bhaktaka* > *bata*

*matta* > *mat*

*padma* > *pam*

*avāpataka* > *wāta*

## §6 Lists of some common mistakes based on Śāradā script

Many mistakes in Śāradā MSS are based on the similarity of certain Śāradā characters or ligatures. These similarities are, of course, are not always apparent to someone who is not familiar with the script. For convenience sake, therefore, the following list, based on experience gained in usage of such MSS, is added.

### *mistakes/variant readings*

a- / yu

u- / ta / rth

ṛ / da

Caṃ / Ce / Co (older Ś.)

Caṃ / Caḥ (older Ś.)

Caḥ / Caṃ (older Ś.)

Cū / Cr (older Ś.)

Cṛ / Cy

Cr / Cṛ (older Ś.)

Ce / Caṃ

Co / Ce / Cai / Cau (older Ś.)

Co / Caṃ

Co / Cā

Cth / Cku / Ckt

Cn / Cr (in older Ś.)

Cr / Cn (in older Ś.)

ku / kt / (C) th

kt / ku / (C) th

kh / gh

gh / kh

ñ / ṭ / j

c / d



cc	/	śś	/	śc
(cch	/	śch) <sup>209</sup>		
j	/	ṭ	/	ñ
ṭ	/	j	/	ñ
ḍ	/	ru	/	t
ḍh	/	ph		
t	/	ru	/	ḍ
ta	/	u-		
tu	/	tt	/	rt / nt
tt	/	rt	/	nt / tu
ty	/	bhy		
tr	/	nn		
th	/	ṣ		
d	/	c		
da	/	ṛ		
dh	/	c		
dhy	/	vy		
dhru	/	bhru		
n	/	r		
nC	/	rC		
nt	/	tt / rt	/	tu
nd	/	rd		
nn	/	tr		
nv	/	rv		
p	/	y		
ph	/	ḍh		
b	/	v		
bdh	/	bv		
br	/	vr		
bhy	/	ty		
bhya	/	rṇa / la		
bv	/	bdh		
m	/	s / p		
y	/	p		
Cy	/	Cṛ		
yu	/	a-		
r	/	n		
ru	/	t / ḍ		



rC	/	nC	
rṇa	/	la	/ bhya
rt	/	tt	/ nt / tu
rth	/	u-	/ ta
rdh	/	rv	/ rb
rv	/	nv	
la	/	rṇa	/ bhya
v	/	b	
vy	/	dhy	
vr	/	br	
śc	/	śś	/ cc
śch	/	cch	
ṣ	/	th	
ṣṭ	=	ṣṭh <sup>210</sup>	
ṣṭ	/	ṣṭh	/ ṣy
ṣṭh	/	ṣṭ	/ ṣy
ṣy	/	ṣṭ	/ ṣṭh
s	/	m	
s	/	p	/ m

*Writing mistakes in Devanāgarī MSS from Kashmir.*

This class of mistakes occurs when scribes copy from Śāradā MSS into other scripts, notably into Devanāgarī. As has been mentioned above, many Kashmiri MSS have been copied in the middle of the last century for the Mahārāja of Jammu and Kashmir which are now kept at the Raghunāth Library at Jammu. In these cases, Bühler's dictum is still valid: "A good many mistakes ... are caused by difficult Śāradā compound letters, and the best plan for restoring corrupt passages is to try to find the Śāradā ligature which most closely resembles the corrupt Devanāgarī group." Since many Kashmirian texts (including the NM) are available in Nāgarī and some other scripts in the various parts of India, it may be useful to add such a list<sup>211</sup>. Some cases of a reverse direction of transmission from Nāgarī into Śāradā, have been discussed elsewhere<sup>212</sup>.

Some typical mistakes include:

u-	>	ta	d	>	m
kh	>	āva	n	>	r
c	>	m	ś	>	m
th	>	ṣ	(s	>	m)
th	>	y	h	>	v



## §7 Palaeography of Śāradā

### Materials:

- The Holy Bible, translated from the originals into the Kashmeera Language*, by the Serampore Mission, Serampore 1821
- G. Bühler, *Indische Palaeographie von circa 350 a. Chr. —circa 1300 p. Chr.* Strassburg 1896 [Engl. transl.: Indian Epigraphy.]
- K. Burkhardt, *Die Kaṣmīr Çakuntalā-Handschrift*, Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Classe CVII. Bd, II Heft, 1884, (2 tables, after p. 640)
- Maurice Bloomfield and Richard Garbe, *The Kashmirian Atharvaveda (school of the Paippalādas) reproduced ...* Baltimore (The Johns Hopkins Press) 1901.
- J. Ph. Vogel, *Antiquities of the Chamba State*, Archeological Survey of India, New Imperial series, XXXVI, Part I, *Inscriptions of the Pre-Muhammadan Period*, Calcutta 1911
- G. Grierson, On the Śāradā-Alphabet. *JRAS* 1916, pp. 677–708
- G. R. Kaye, *The Bakhshālī Manuscript, A Study in Medieval Mathematics*, Archeological Survey of India, New Imperial Series, XLIII, Calcutta 1927
- J. Filliozat, Paléographie, in: L. Renou - J. Filliozat, *L'Inde classique*, vol. 2, Paris 1953, pp. 665–712 [reprint 1985]
- Lore Sander, *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung*, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 8, Wiesbaden 1968
- B.K. Kaul Deambi, *Corpus of Śāradā Inscriptions of Kashmir with special reference to origin and development of Śāradā script*, Delhi (Agam Kala Prakashan) 1982
- K. R. van Kooij, Die sogenannte Guptahandschrift des Kubjikāmatatantra, Supplementband ZDMG 1975, pp. 88–90
- Palaeographical Society
- Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, ed. H. Bechert, (Śatapiṭaka Ser. 228) New Delhi 1976.

### Notes

1. Author, *The Veda in Kashmir*, ch. XI, forthcoming.
2. In addition, the Kashmir version of many texts represents an older subdivision of North Indian texts: such is the case with the Mahābhārata, the minor Upaniṣads, etc.
3. For a brief discussion, see author, On the Archetype of Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya. *IJ* 29 (1986), pp. 249–259.
4. There are, of course, exceptions. Especially those scholars who work with Buddhist texts from



- Gilgit and Hsinking are aware of the various older forms of Gupta, Śāradā and Nāgarī scripts, and the changes in writing styles—though not always of the consequences these changes have for the transmission of these texts.
5. We must not forget that the early Nāgarī scripts, i.e. Western Nāgarī of Gujarat/Maharāṣṭra and even the Eastern one of Nepal, Bihar, Bengal and Orissa still were very similar to each other, barring a few characters such as ś, ñ, ṇ, etc.
  6. Cf. author, *III* 29, p. 253
  7. Cf. also the nucleus of the Nepalese Svayambhūpurāṇa and the related Khotan legends, in comparison with the legends about the Lake of Kashmir.
  8. See author, *Die Atharvaveda-Tradition und die Paippalāda-Saṃhitā*, *Supplement VI*, *ZDMG*, Stuttgart 1985, p. 258.
  9. For example, such writings as homorganic nasal before occlusive (-ṃ k-, etc.) are already found in Kuṣāṇa time MSS from Eastern Turkestan (Berlin collection).
  10. And -ch- in Gujarati Veda MSS; (note also that the older Nepalese MSS represent any ch as cch in any position.
  11. See author, ed. *Kaṭha Āraṇyaka*, introd., and: *Die Kaṭha-Śikṣā-Upaniṣad und ihr Verhältnis zur Śikṣāvallī der Taittirīya-Upaniṣad*. *WZKS* XXIII (1979) p. 5 sqq., XXIV (1980), p. 21 sqq.
  12. For notes on this topic, cf. Bühler, *Report*, and for the RV manuscr. from Kashmir, I. Scheftelowitz, *Zur Kritik und Lautlehre des Rgveda*, *WZKM* 21, pp. 85–142, Dumont, *Fs. Brown*.
  13. Cf. Scheftelowitz p. 115
  14. For the RV, see Scheftelowitz p. 116 sqq. For detailed information, see *The Veda in Kashmir*, ch. III (forthc.)
  15. Cf. Scheftelowitz p. 112; cf. K. Hoffmann, *Aufsätze*, p. 548 n. 3.
  16. Cf. Scheftelowitz p. 112.
  17. Cf. Scheftelowitz p. 118.
  18. Cf. Scheftelowitz p. 120.
  19. Cf. Scheftelowitz p. 114, cf. Roth, *ZDMG* 46, p. 103, and for other texts, K. Hoffmann, *Aufsätze* p. 188.
  20. Cf. Scheftelowitz p. 93 sqq.
  21. Scheftelowitz p. 93, cf. Roth, *ZDMG* 46, p. 1; K. Hoffmann, *Aufsätze* p. 46, p. 548 n. 3.
  22. Cf. the case of Nepal where palm leaf MSS were used until the middle or the end of the 15th century, in spite of the close contact with Tibet, and via Tibet, with China. The oldest paper MS. known to me is dated 1380 A.D. There always is a certain period of overlap when both materials are used.
  23. It has, however, been used even earlier by exiled Kashmiri Brahmins, see the Berlin MS of the Cārāyaṇīya Mantrādhyāya, prefixed to the MS of the Kaṭha Saṃhitā (for details, see *the Veda in Kashmir*, ch. VIII).
  24. *Detailed report on a tour in search of Sanskrit MSS made in Kaśmir, Rajputana, and Central India*, special number of *JRASB* 1877.
  25. *Report*, p. 29 sqq.
  26. Maurice Bloomfield and Richard Garbe, *The Kashmirian Atharvaveda (School of the Paippalādas) reproduced ...* Baltimore (The Johns Hopkins Press) 1901, introd.
  27. G. R. Kaye, *The Bakhshālī Manuscript. A study in Medieval Mathematics*, (Archaeological Service of India, New Imperial Series Vol. XLIII, parts I and II), Calcutta 1927, p. 4 sp. Kaye further refers (p. 5) to E. Radcliffe in the *Indian Forester*, vol. xxviii, 1902, pp. 25–27 and other personal information.
  28. For example, the Gilgit MSS, the Bakhshali MS, and the Central Asian MSS used by Lore Sanders, *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung*, *Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, Supplementband 8, Wiesbaden 1968.



29. Repeated by Bloomfield and Garbe, *The Kashmirian Atharvaveda*, Baltimore 1901, introd.
30. Stein, too, regarded the Kāvyaaprakāśaśaṃketa MS. as the latest, it is, however, dated Śaka 1570 = A.D. 1648–49, see *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* transl. p. 47.
31. For a description, G. Bühler, *Monatsberichte der Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1879, Berlin 1880, pp. 200–202; see now Walter Slaje, *Katalog der Sanskrit-Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Sammlungen Marcus Aurel Stein und Carl Alexander von Hügel)*. (Akad. Wiss. Wien, phil.-hist. Kl. 546) Wien 1990.
32. See P.N. Kaul Bamzai, *A history of Kashmir*, Delhi 1962.
33. Cf. Kaye, p. 7 on the Kharoṣṭhī (Gāndhārī) Dharmapada from Khotan, the Bower MS from Khotgarh, the Bakhshālī MS, the Kashmirian AV, and the Deccan Colege RV.
34. See the edition by G.R. Kaye, *The Bakhshālī Manuscript, A Study in Medieval Mathematics*, Archeological Survey of India, New Imperial series, XLIII, Calcutta 1927; there are older ones from Central Asia, see Lore Sander, *Paläographisches*.
35. See van Kooij, *ZDMG Supplement* 1975
36. From among these three MSS only the Bakhshālī MS has been used by Deambi for his paleography: B.K. Kaul Deambi, *Corpus of Śāradā Inscriptions of Kashmir with special reference to origin and development of Śāradā script*, Delhi (Agam Kala Prakashan) 1982
37. Maurice Bloomfield and Richard Garbe, *The Kashmirian Atharvaveda (school of the Paippalādas) reproduced ...* Baltimore (The Johns Hopkins Press) 1901, p. II sq.
38. It still was common practice in the last century to use birchbark as roofing material. —cf. also Stein, transl. *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, p. 46 n. 5 on the Antwerp baptism of his Rājatarāṅgiṇī paper MS, and cf. Stein and Schroeder on their Ṛcakas (below).
39. *The Kashmirian Atharvaveda*, Baltimore 1901.
40. Kaye p. 6. —It should be added that the same could be tried, with some success, when the page numbers are broken off, for the lenticles which re-appear on several usually consecutive pages.
41. Cf. also Bühler, *Report* p. 29.
42. Kaye p. 6
43. Cf. Stein, transl. *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, p. 51, who reports *sheaves* of 8 fol. each.
44. This is as remarkable as the equally unorthodox Kashmirian trait of meat eating. In Nepal, too, I have occasionally seen book covers made of leather. As the MSS, however, have the form of *pothis* or *leporellos* (*thyasaphus*, 'folded books' in Nepal) which also are found in South-East Asia, the cover takes the form of a sleeve-like cover.
45. However, compare Kaye, pp. 8–10 on other formats of early examples of *bhūrja* MSS, influenced by papyrus and palm leaf style MSS.
46. The Kaṭha Brāhmaṇa MS at Hoshiarpur
47. Cf. Stein, on the fate of his Ṛcaka, called Codex Stein by Schroeder.
48. For examples of such MSS, see the facsimile of the Tübingen Paippalāda codex, ed. by Bloomfield and Garbe, 1901, or the recent facsimile edition of the Bhāgavata Purāṇā, ed. H. Bechert, (*Śatapitaka Ser. 228*) New Delhi 1976.
49. Other than Bühler stated, the writers of such manuscripts usually do *not* make an attempt at "cooking".
50. See *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 4.117.
51. Dated 1.1.1894 from Jaworzno (in then Austro-Hungarian Galicia, S. Poland); *ZDMG* 49, p. 148.
52. This is the local designation for a *purohita*.
53. In the Seventies we have tried, at Tübingen and Munich Libraries, some birch bark restoration by laminating the MSS with plastic sheet. They become very clearly readable that way, —just like by wetting them, as described by Bühler and Garbe/Bloomfield—and they also are flexible and cannot be damaged anymore by bending. However, no one knows the long term effect of the various chemical substances interacting with the bark and it may turn out that simply keeping such leaves



under glass, as has been done with most of the oldest Indian MSS from Hsinking, is the best way of preserving them. —Laminating with thin rice paper, as I have seen in the National Archives of India, does not always preserve the readability. It has worked badly in the case of their Kashmirian Upaniṣad collection written on paper: the chemicals involved have acted in such a way that the ink of one side of a folio has penetrated on the other side, so that nothing is clearly readable any more.

54. *The Kashmirian Atharvaveda*, Baltimore 1901, introd.
55. See the description by Bühler in the *Akadem. Monatsberichte*, Berlin 1879
56. B.K. Kaul Deambi, *Corpus of Śārādā Inscriptions of Kashmir*, Delhi 1982. Unfortunately this is limited to the materials available to him in Kashmir and Northern India. For example the MS of the Kubjikāmata Tantra at Calcutta (see van Kooij) has not been used, and MSS in Western libraries have not been utilized either.
57. Cf. the same position of *mayā* in the colophon of the von Hügel Ṛcaka, below: *śrī-pre-rajāna-vāṭike-sthita mayā dāsatiḍāsa-dara-paṃdherakena ayam karmakāṇḍo vedapustakam sampāḍitam*; or the colophon of the Berlin MS of BĀU (Chambers 122b, Weber 210), written by an exiled Kashmiri Paṇḍit: *idaṃ pustakam mayā paṇḍita-kāśmīra-vāsinā gobhanāmnā śrī kāṣṭh-viśveśvaranagarī-madhye gaṅgāsamīpe lalicarāṇamūle likhitam samvat 1840*.
58. For further discussion, see *The Veda in Kashmir*, ch. III
59. Cf. Kielhorn on this point, *Kleine Schriften*. p. 502 sq.
60. Cf. however, Kielhorn, Göttingen collection on this point; cf. *Kleine Schriften*, p. 617 sqq.
61. See description by Bühler, *Akad. Monatsberichte*, Berlin 1875.
62. On this locality, see Stein, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī transl.* II p. 61, ad 8.756.
63. A common abbreviation of (*Parihāsa*-) *pure* = Srinagar.
64. See description by Bühler, *Akad. Monatsber.*, Berlin 1875.
65. For an example see K.L. Janert in Tribus, describing a MS. of the Linden Museum at Stuttgart.
66. This also happens to the non-Indian writer. For example, I noticed that I sometimes confuse Śārādā ś (which looks like Nāgarī *m*) and write *m*, even when copying into Roman letters. This is a typical mistake that occurs in the Nāgarī copies made from Śārādā originals as well.
67. The *l* used in Vedic MSS now and in printed editions is a Marathi invention expressing one of their *l*-sounds.
68. Still under the Dharmārth Trust established in the last century. One is advised apply to the Kashmirian *yuvarāj*, Dr. Karan Singh, at New Delhi for usage of the collection.
69. The MSS bought in Kashmir by Bühler were stored at the Deccan College. After the College had been dissolved in the Thirties they went to the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute where they remain.
70. See catalogue and description by L.v. Schroeder, *Die Tübinger Kaṭha-Handschriften, Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserl. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil-hist. Kl. 137*, Wien 1898.
71. Cf. Stein's description of the archetype of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī and its annotators, *transl.* p. 45 sqq.
72. MSS are said to have been dumped there during the persecutions around 1400 A.D.
73. Śrīvara, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, 1.5.75 sqq., tr. p. 145
74. P.N. Kaul Bamzai, *A History of Kashmir*, Delhi 1962, p. 305
75. For details, see author, *The Veda in Kashmir*, forthcoming.
76. *Report* p. 28
77. Now finally described by W. Slaje, *Katalog der Sanskrit-Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Sammlungen Marcus Aurel Stein und Carl Alexander von Hügel)*, *SB Akad. d. Wiss., Bd. 546*, Wien 1990
78. See G.M. Clauson, Catalogue of the Stein collection of Sanskrit MSS from Kashmir, *JRAS* 1912, pp. 587–627, for a list of his MSS which he (at first) gave on loan to the Indian Institute at Oxford.
79. Apparently after May 3, 1948, the last entry, and before the date the collection at Delhi was started, with no. 213 on April 27, 1951.



80. *A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Oudh for the year 1882 [-1890], Complied by the order of the Government, N.-W. P. and Oudh, by Devi Prasāda, Head Pandit of the Sanskrit Pāthsālā, Ayodhya, Fasciculus XV [-XXII], Allahabad 1883 [-1893]*
81. For example, Surya Kanta found one of the large Ṛcakas he used in his *Kāṭhaka Saṃkalana* (Lahore 1943) in a Kashmiri Muslim's house at Lahore.
82. Devi Prasāda, *Catalogue of Skt. MSS in Oudh*, Fasc. XV [-XXII], Allahabad 1883 [-1893]
83. Bühler, *Report* p. 55, note.
84. For example, I have seen a collection of some 15 large bundles of MSS with a local bookseller at Benares; he luckily had salvaged them from an old Pandit who had destined them for immersion at the time of his death.
85. By the Serampore missionaries in 1820.
86. From Bühler, *Report*, continued p. 31
87. For a treatment of this alphabet, see the list of Akṣaras and ligatures taken from the Śakuntalā MS, published by Burckhardt, *SB Akad.* Wien, CVII, 1884, Bühler's own Indian Paleography (for the older period), the list of modern Śāradā letters and ligatures, published by G. Grierson *JRAS* 1916, pp. 677-708, as well as the more detailed treatment of the script by J.Ph.Vogel, *Antiquities of the Chamba State*, Archaeological Survey of India, New Imperial series, XXXVI, Part I, *Inscriptions of the Pre-Muhammadan Period*, Calcutta 1911, G.R. Kaye, *The Bakhshālī Manuscript*, Calcutta 1927, and now, B.K.Kaul Deambi, *Corpus*; cf. also Paleographic society, facsimile (cf. K.R. van der Kooij, on 12th cent. Śāradā Ms. from Nepal) *ZDMG Suppl.* 1975 pp. 881-890.
88. K. Burkhardt, Die Kaṣmīr Çakuntalā-Handschrift, *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Classe* CVII. Bd. II Heft, 1884, (2 tables)
89. G. Grierson, On the Śāradā-Alphabet. *JRAS* 1916, pp. 677-708.
90. *The Bakhshālī Manuscript*, Calcutta 1927, pp. 87-99 with tables I-IV.
91. Central Asian MSS of the 13/14th cent., see: Lore Sander, *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung*, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 8, Wiesbaden 1968
92. K.R. van Kooij, *Supplementband ZDMG* 1975
93. By Bloomfield and Garbe, Stuttgart 1901.
94. Barret, L.C. 1905-1940. "The Kashmirian Atharva Veda", [Book 1] *JAOS* 26 (1905), [Book 2] 30 (1910), [Book 3] 32 (1912), [Book 4] 35 (1915), [Book 5] 37 (1917), [Book 7] 40 (1920), [Book 8] 41 (1921), [Book 9] 42 (1922), [Book 10] 43 (1923), [Book 11] 44 (1924), [Book 12] 46 (1926), [Book 13] 48 (1928), [Book 14] 47 (1927), [Book 15] 50 (1930), [Book 18] 58 (1937); *The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Books 16 and 17*. New Haven 1936; Books 19 and 20, New Haven 1940. Book 6 has been edited by F. Edgerton, "The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Book Seven", *JAOS* 34 (1914), pp. 374-411.
95. B.K. Kaul Deambi, *Corpus of Śāradā Inscriptions of Kashmir with special reference to origin and development of Śāradā script*, Delhi (Agam Kala Prakashan) 1982
96. A primer old Śāradā is now under preparation by W. Slaje.
97. Cf. Stein, *transl. Rājatarahṇī*, on this topic, p. 47.
98. On this point see below, on pronunciation: they are elided, with lengthening of the preceding syllable.
99. Between 1774 and 1799, at Calcutta. See the catalogue of the Berlin collection by A. Weber: *Die Handschriften der Königl. Bibliothek, herausgegeben von dem königl. Oberbibliothekar Geheimen Regierungsrath Dr. Pertz. Erster Band. Verzeichniss der Sanskrit-Handschriften von Herrn Dr. Weber*, Berlin 1853, p. X sq.
100. See *Report*.
101. *Mahānayaṇaparakāśa* ed. by K. Sambasiva Sastrin, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 130, Trivandrum 1937
102. G. Grierson, *Lallā-Vākyānī or the wise sayings of Lal Ded, a mystic poetess of ancient Kashmir*,



London 1920.

103. See Grierson, introd. p. 7, and p. 128.
104. Study by G. Grierson, *The Language of the Mahā-naya-Prakāśa. An examination of the Kāshmīrī as written in the fifteenth century. Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. XI, No. 2, pp. 73–130, Calcutta 1929.*
105. *The Veda in Kashmir*, forthc.
106. There are just a few peculiarities, such as the pronunciation of *-l-*, *-lh-*, etc.
107. The following investigation is based on tape recordings I made during my stay in Srinagar in August 1973. It is supplemented by a few examples from the many more recordings I made during my second and last, one month stay in the Valley, in August 1979.
108. Bühler, *Report* pp. 25–26: “The chief peculiarities of the Kaśmīrian pronunciation are:
  - ā- [ɔ:] (Engl.: *fall*)
  - i- [ɛ, yɛ] (short *e*)
  - i- [e, ye]
  - i [ü] (German *ü*)
  - ī [ū]
  - u- [võ] (short *o*, as in: *god*)
  - u- [öü]
  - ū- [vū]
  - ṛ [rě, rū] thus *kṛṣṇa* [krěṣṇa, krūsṇa]
  - e [i, ī, ěī]
  - o+Nas./Liqu. [ō ũ]
 aspirate consonant > unaspirate consonant [NB: in modern pronunciation, this is correct only for mediae; but in writing the confusion occasionally extends to tenues as well, see below]  
 kṣa [khye]  
 ṣa [śa, sometimes sa]  
 ḥ [very soft, almost inaudible]  
 in addition:  
 a [a, ō, õ] as in India  
 indistinctness of all vowels in thesi.”
109. Usually, scholars have referred to Bühler’s *Report* and the few peculiarities noted by him, but nobody, unfortunately including Barret, has made a study of these Kashmiri peculiarities. This has hindered very much, especially in the case of the study of the PS, in reaching a proper understanding of the corrupt parts of the text.
110. The following list is based on an analysis of Veda recordings made in 1973 referred to above.
111. Cf. Wackernagel, *Ai. Gramm. I*, 281 on quick recitation and suppression of vowels (similar to Japanese *kits<sup>ne</sup>*, *kts<sup>ne</sup>*, etc.)
112. Morgenstierne, *Acta Orientalia* 19, pp. 79–99 See below, at the end.
113. Note that this is not found in modern Veda recitation were: *vr > r*
114. Special changes (Grierson, *Standard Manual*, p. 23):
 

k <sup>ü</sup>	>	c <sup>ü</sup>	ky	>	cy	ke	>	ce
kh <sup>ü</sup>	>	ch <sup>ü</sup>	khy	>	chy	khe	>	che
g <sup>ü</sup>	>	j <sup>ü</sup>	gy	>	jy	ge	>	je
t <sup>ü</sup>	>	t <sup>sü</sup>	ty	>	t <sup>s</sup>	tye	>	t <sup>s</sup> a
th <sup>ü</sup>	>	t <sup>s</sup> h <sup>ü</sup>	thy	>	t <sup>s</sup> h	thye	>	t <sup>s</sup> ha
d <sup>ü</sup>	>	z <sup>ü</sup>	dy	>	z	dye	>	za
n <sup>ü</sup>	>	ñ <sup>ü</sup>	ny	>	ñ	nye	>	ñe



jü	>	jü	ly	>	jy	lye	>	je
hü	>	šü	hy	>	šy	hye	>	še

ti	>	ci	ty	>	cy	te	>	ce
thi	>	chi	thy	>	chy	the	>	che
di	>	ji	dy	>	j	de	>	je

<Note the importance of these changes for explaining the changes in PS d/j, t/s for t>t>s, see Morgenstierne, p. 93: "dialect">

-k	>	kh
-ṭ	>	ṭh
-t	>	th
-p	>	ph
-t <sup>s</sup>	>	t <sup>s</sup> h

115. Note that these are some centuries older than the present pronunciation and recitation.

116. He notes further:

z		voiced dental affricate
j	>	ž sometimes
c	>	s sometimes (probl. dialectic, but cf. above!)
h		slightly sonant;
-h		often > φ
r	>	ṛ in village dialects

117. See for more details, *The Veda in Kashmir*, ch. III and *The Paippalāda hymn to Takman* (forthc.)

118. Cf. the early Kashmiri phrase reported by Kalhaṇa, *raṅgassa helu diṇṇa* (5.397).

119. Cf. already Stein ad Rājatarāṅgiṇī 1.86 and Hultsch, *Ind. Ant.* 18, 69. Both stress the role of popular etymology which led to the identification of certain place names with those of early kings.

120. Provided that the information given by Kalhaṇa on the founders is correct (see the ch. on Brahmins elsewhere in this book).

121. Cf. a foundation of *Khāgikā* made by Gopāditya, 1.340, see below, n. 86. Note that there also is a Khaga Nāga at NM. 959.

122. Modern Gudar and Asṭhēl, on the right bank of the Veśau River, see Stein ad 1.96.

123. Perhaps modern Zölur (Zohlir) in Zain<sup>g</sup>gir<sup>i</sup> Pargaṇa.

124. Mod. Śāngas on the right bank of the Ar<sup>g</sup>path River in Kuṭ<sup>h</sup>hār Pargaṇa.

125. Mod. Śnār in Vihi Pargaṇa.

126. The more recent development of Śamāṅgāsā and Śanarā has been explained in detail by Stein, from Śamāṅgāsā > \*śmāṅgāsā > śvāṅgās (in a gloss) > mod. Śāngas; Śanarā > \*śnarā > śnār (gloss) > mod. Śār. For similar 'telescopic' forms see Stein on *Atyugrapura* > Agrōr, at 8.3402. — Śanarā can be derived from the name of the king Śacīnara: \*Śacīnara-agrahāra > \*Śanara-hār > Śanarā.

127. He also is reported to have founded the town of *Soraka* near the Darad country, 1.93. The name obviously is a Prakrit form based on \*Saura-ka, as the manuscript L indeed reads.

128. The name of the Saurasa-Vihāra is enigmatic. Perhaps = mod. Suras, see Stein ad 1.94; of course, it could simply be derived from *su-rasa-vihāra*.

129. Cf. the similar assumption made by Stein in the explanation of Śamāṅgāsā > mod. Śāngas, above.

130. This would also provide a means to find out whether the official names of such monasteries were given in the church language, in Gāndhārī, or in the local Kashmiri Prakrit form. Note that at c. 850 A.D., at least one of Anandavardhana's work is, at least in part, in Mahārāṣṭrī Pkt.: *Viśamabāṇalīlā*, see K.S. Kavirajan, *Contribution of Kashmir to Sanskrit Literature*, Bangalore 1970, p. 201; cf. also D. Ingalls, *The Dhvanyāloka of Āṇadavardhana*, Cambridge 1990, p. 10 and his notes on the importance of Pkt., in this context. Note that Abhinavagupta uses even more recent language (Apabhraṃsa) in some of the verses, for example in the Tantrasāra.



131. In correspondence with the development in the rest of India, cf. the Sanskrit inscription of Rudradāman (c. 130–150 A.D.), the Guptas, etc.
132. Already noticed by Venis, ed. in the Vizianagaram Skt. Ser., p. 274: Jayanta's grandfather obtained the village of *Gauramūlaka*; cf. also J.S. Bhattacharya, *transl. of the Nyāyamañjarī*, p. xxxiii, p. 567; see also K.S.Nagarajan, *Contribution of Kashmir to Sanskrit Literature*, Bangalore 1970, p. 204.
133. Modern *Khun<sup>a</sup>moh*, near Pāmpar; it was Bilhaṇa's home village, Khonamuṣa (vs. 71).
134. Identified by Stein as Kaimoh and Ramuh, in Aḍ<sup>a</sup>vin Pargaṇa, on the left "bank of the Veśau River, viz. a village between Srinagar and Śūpiyān; cf. also *Khonamuś/ṣa* of Kalhaṇa, Bilhaṇa, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and note that there also is a *Katikā* (Rājatarāṅgiṇī 2.14) and *Katimuṣa* (2.55); the occurrence independently of each other underlines the suffix nature of *-muṣa*.
135. Most of the river names are so thoroughly Sanskritized that their original names no longer are discernable. The situation is quite different in neighboring Nepal, see author, *Nepalese Hydronomy*, in: *Proceedings of the Franco-German conference on Nepal, June 1990*, ed. by G. Toffin, Paris 1993.
136. Such changes are, of course, not limited to Indo-Aryan. For example, in the local Franconian dialect of Aschaffenburg, east of Frankfurt, the town is called [*ašeberg*], or the local Engl. pronunciation of New Orleans is [*nōrlinz*], and that of Worcester is [*wūster*] both in England and in New England—something out of state people usually do not know.
137. G. Grierson, *The Language of the Mahā-Naya-Prakāśa. An examination of the Kāshmīrī as written in the fifteenth century*. *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. XI, No. 2, pp. 73–130, Calcutta 1929.
138. See Grierson, p. 133.
139. Cf. also K.S. Nagarajan, *Contribution*, p. 419.
140. Die Atharvavedatradition und die Paippalāda-Saṃhitā. *ZDMG, Supplementband VI*, Stuttgart 1985, pp. 256–271, and in *The Veda in Kashmir*, ch. III (forthc.)
141. The famous story of Indra cutting off the head of Tvaṣṭṛ's son Viśvarūpa, because he had mispronounced the accent of *indraśātru* as *indraśatru* (TS 2.4.12.1, cf. ŚB 1.2.3.2, 1.6.3.8–10), is well known even today among Brahmins.
142. Only two MSS were known for the edition of M.K. Śāstrī, KSTS; I noticed the following: at the MSS Library of the Research Department of the Archives, now in the University:  
no. 2263 Mahānayaprakāśa, fol. 31  
no. 2354 Mahānayaprakāśa, fol. 40  
(nothing at Delhi, National Archives and National Museum).
143. Thus Edgerton.
144. Ed. A.B. Keith, Oxford, 1909 (repr. 1969).
145. He is well known from his glosses in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, see Stein, *transl.* p. 48 sq.
146. In *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, Kṣemendra's *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's *Nyāyamañjarī*.
147. Examples: patha > vath  
                  vana > van  
                  saras > sar  
                  naḍvalā > nambal
148. a > ö āśrama > "höm
149. -a > ø pura > pūr, pōr
150. -ā- > ā nāga > nāg  
                  nāḍa > nār  
                  śālā > hām
151. a > o vāṭa > vōr
152. ā > a āśrama > "höm
153. -ā > ø



- galikā > gul  
bhaṭṭārikā > brār  
maṭhikā > mārḡ  
naḍvalā > nambal
154. -i- > i  
>  $\phi$  maṭhikā > mārḡ  
galikā > gul
155. -i >  $\phi$  khani > khan
156. -u- > u kuṇḍala > kuṇḍal
157. Mārtāṇḍa is written *mṛtāṇḍa* in inscr. 15, Deambi, *Corpus*, p. 137; see facs. in transl. *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, by R.S Pandit, plate XI, appendix.
158. The pronunciation of *ai* as [i] is seen in the 1484 A.D. inscr. no. 11, Deambi p. 128: *Ibrahīm*=  
| aibrahm |
159. -o- > o koṭṭa > koṭh
160. Cf. also Sandhi in Ved. MSS:  
viśvā agne > viśvāgne  
-ā a- > ā  
-ā ā- > ā  
-o a- > -o (')  
-dham- > -tān-t-s
161. *imh* > *ih*; cases of : -*siṃha*: -*sīha*:  
janakasimha, jayasimha, kandarpasimha, samarasimha, tilakasimha, vicitrasimha, vijayasimha, but:  
śṛṅgāra-siha, sugandhi-siha, udaya-siha, viḍḍa-siha.
162. "fairly frequent are changes between voiced/unvoiced, aspirated/unaspirated consonants"
163. As Kashmiri teacher in Tibet, see J. Naudou, *Buddhists of Kashmir*, Delhi 1980, p. 47, 97.
164. *Nyāyamañjari*, Vizianagaram Skt. Ser., Benares 1895, p. 274: Jayanta's grandfather obtained, by a certain sacrifice, the village of *Gauramūlaka*=Ghoramūlaka in Kalhaṇa, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 8.1861, with note by Stein; note: *gh/g, o/au*.
165. According to Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 26, the relationship of the two sounds would normally be 0.17 : 0.1 (averages from 10,000 sounds, see *JAOS* 10, p. cl)
166. Whitney has: 0.1 : 0.3
167. Whitney has: 2.85 : 0.83
168. Whitney has 0.46 : 1.27
169. -k- > k kuṇḍala > kuṇḍal  
koṭṭa > koṭh  
kulya > kul  
> g maṭhikā > mārḡ  
>  $\phi$  galikā > gul
170. -kh- > kh khani > khan
171. -g- > g grāma > gām, gōm
172. -t- > r vāṭa > vōr  
> r bhaṭṭārikā > brār
173. -ṭ- > ṭh koṭṭa > koṭh
174. -ṭh > r maṭhikā > mārḡ
175. -d- > r nāḍa > nār
176. -th- > th patha > vath
177. -n- > n nāga > nāg  
nāḍa > nār  
vana > van



178. *-p-* > *v* patha > vath  
 179. *-bh-* > *b* bhaṭṭārikā > brār  
 180. *-m-* > *m* grāma > gām, gōm  
           mathikā > mārg  
           āśrama > \*hōm  
 181. *y* > *j* jona-rāja  
 182. *-r-* > *r* bhaṭṭārikā > brār  
           saras > sar  
 183. *l/r* in *Jiṣṭhaludra* for *Jyeṣṭharudra*, as name of the modern Śankara Hill, see Deambi, *Corpus*, p. 129, Stein, transl. *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* II, 289. Note also Bühler, *Report*, p. 9: regular change, with a substitution of *ra* for *la* in the name of the Vollur lake < Skt. *ullola*. (Dissimilation)  
 184. *-l-* > *l* kuṇḍala > kuṇḍal  
           galikā > gul  
           śālā > hām  
           naḍvalā > nambal  
 185. *-v-* > *v* vana > van  
           vāṭa > vōr  
 186. *-ś-* > *h* śālā > hām  
 187. And retrograde: Scheftelowitz, *WZKM* 21, p. 123 sqq., Zachariae, *Epilegomena zum Maṅkhakośa*, p. 9 sqq.; Bakhshālī MS, see Hoernle, *Verhandl. d. 7. Oriental. Kongr.* p. 138;  
 188. Deambi, *Corpus*, p. 119 sqq.; Khonamuh is situated 9 miles south-east of Srinagar; mentioned by Kalhaṇa as *Khonamuṣa*, by Bilhaṇa as *Khonamuśa*! This shows that the pronunciation of *ś/ṣ* at c. 1100 A.D. was [ṣ] already; cf. Bühler, *Report* p. 4. The Khonmuh inscription (1428 A.D.) shows the same indiscriminate use, see Deambi, p. 119.  
 189. And retrograde: Scheftelowitz, *WZKM* 21, p. 123 sqq., Zachariae, *Epilegomena zum Maṅkhakośa*, p. 9 sqq.; Bakhshālī MS, see Hoernle, *Verhandl. d. 7. Oriental. Kongr.* p. 138; see note 187.  
 190. *-s-* > *s* saras > sar  
 191. *-s/h-* > *ϕ* saras/h > sar  
 192. *kṣ* > *ḥkh* (so far unnoticed) in:  
     *Laḥkhaṇa-Narendra-Āditya*  
     *Narendra-Āditya Laḥkhana*  
     *bhiḥka-rāja*  
     *Lakkana* < *kṣ*  
     *Sulakkana* < *kṣ*  
     :: many-*kṣ*-cases  
 193. *-ṇḍ-* > *ṇḍ* kuṇḍala > kuṇḍal  
 194. *rundhmo* > *rudhaso* (involving the common misreading *m* > *s*)  
 195. *Cy* > *CC*: Ṭakki- < Śākya-? (Panjabi Prākṛt?)  
 196. *dy* > *ij*? : *bijja-rāja* (= *vidyā*?)  
 197. In early Kashmiri, as mentioned by Kalhaṇa, at *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 5.398: *raṅgassa helu dinna*, which would be modern Kashmiri: *raṅgas hēl/hyūlu dyur*.  
     \**dinnam* (= *dattam*) > *dinna* (by Kalhaṇa's time);  
     Gen. sg. *-sya* > *-ssa*.  
 198. *rC* > *CC*; Gagga :: Garga in *Gagga-candra*  
 199. *Jajja-rāja* :: *Jarja-rāja*; *Jajjala-rāja*  
 200. *dhamaṭa* < *dharma*?  
 201. *-Cr-* > *Cϕ* grāma > gām, gōm  
 202. *-śr-* > *h* āśrama > \*hōm  
 203. *-ly-* > *-lh-*: Kalhaṇa :: *kalyāna-candra*; *bilhaṇa*, *gulhaṇa*, *rilhaṇa*, *salhaṇa*, *ulhaṇa*, *kalhaṇa*.



204. -Cy- > Cϕ kulyā > kul  
 205. -ḍv- > mb naḍvalā > nambal  
 206. rundhmo > rudhaso (involving the common misreading m > s)  
 207. In the colophon of PS.  
 208. In Ved. MSS:  
     °gnindi > °gnirdi (writing mistake)  
     etaṁdhū > etandhu  
     anaśśu > anaśrū  
     tam payas > tamī pas  
     tapasas ta > tapas ta  
     tastam > taṁmmā  
     evata > eta  
     yo'to'sru > ya taśśru  
     yad agnau > padapra !  
     sāsāha > śasaha  
     brahmāṇam > brāhmaṇam  
     vidan | śyeno > vidaka chyaino (note: where the MS. was damaged; T<sub>6</sub>:Ch:W<sub>1</sub> confuse relation)  
     hā > ghno KS 1.1 : 16.6  
     hā > hā KS 1.1 : 16.6  
     gho > ghnā KS 1.1 : 16.6  
     ghna > ghra KS 1.1 : 16.6  
 209. Note: *cch* is not used in Kashmir but is always written as *śch*! —Older Nepalese MSS also tend to write *cch*- in cases where we normally write *ch*-.  
 210. These are identical in later Śāradā.  
 211. For a case of a Kashmiri text, the Pādatāḍitaka by Śyāmilaka, which has been transmitted in Malayalam script, see Vreese, *III* 13, p. 44 sqq. For a good example of "Kashmiri mistakes" in Devanāgarī MSS and in print, see the Benares edition of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's *Nyāyamañjari* (and cf. *The Veda in Kashmir*, ch., IV, forthc.).  
 212. See author, *ZDMG, Supplementband VI*, Stuttgart 1985, pp. 256–271.